

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14939. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 14940. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14941. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14942. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 14943. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14944. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 906), as amended, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14945. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 14946. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14947. A bill to amend title I of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 14948. A bill to amend the charter of the Disabled American Veterans to provide for an annual audit of its accounts by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 1138. Joint resolution to establish a commission which shall conduct on the Capitol Grounds a program depicting historical events by means of son et lumière; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 1139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 634. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Con. Res. 635. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce

selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Con. Res. 636. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H. Con. Res. 637. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Con. Res. 638. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Res. 847. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed transfer of the Army and Air Force Exchange Services from New York City; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

469. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the removal of restrictions on the movement of merchandise in highway vehicles on Alaska and British Columbia ferries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

470. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the preservation of Morro Rock as a historical site, natural landmark, and public park; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

471. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the construction of experimental fish protein concentrate plants; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

472. Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Federal center for research into the cause, prevention, control, and treatment of alcoholics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the inte-

grated development of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nguong Thi Tran (formerly Nguyen Thi Nyuong, A13 707-473 D/3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

386. By the SPEAKER: Petition of International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, San Jose, Calif., relative to situs picketing legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

387. Also, petition of Building and Construction Trades Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to situs picketing legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

Bishop Paul V. Galloway, Arkansas area of the Methodist Church, Little Rock, Ark., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we ask Thy care for these who are committed to Thee and our Nation.

Give them wisdom, great faith, and creativeness. Bless them, their families, those who work in their offices, and the States from which they come.

Let the light of Thy presence be upon them and within them. Bless our President and Vice President, our Congress and all who give themselves to our Government and institutions. Bless our men and women in the armed services at home and abroad—and all forces of righteousness, reconciliation, and redemption.

Help us to know that Thou art here and that Thy concern is for every person in every land.

On land and sea, and in sky and hearts may Thy name be revered and our people united in purpose and direction.

In Thy love and life we would live and serve now and always. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1966, was dispensed with.

**MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION**

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 5, 1966, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to provide for the designation of the week of May 8–May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

**REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION
OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
(H. DOC. NO. 437)**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:
Seven months ago, Public Law 89–10, providing massive aid to improve elementary and secondary education, went into effect. At that time we called upon leaders of education in States and local school districts to translate this financial assistance into educational services for the millions of disadvantaged children in our schools: the children who desperately need additional attention if they are to overcome the handicaps of poverty.

I am happy to transmit to you the first report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Their comments on the progress which has been achieved by States and local schools reveal that educators from all levels of government are working together to provide equal educational opportunities for all.

I am particularly encouraged by the major focus of activities identified in the report: to improve language skills in the early years. Nothing could be more fundamental than this work in assisting children who have been denied normal educational opportunities through poverty or neglect.

The commission members have not failed to point out areas in the program that need additional attention. I have pledged that every effort will be made to meet these problems—and I am confident that the Congress will join in these efforts.

We have begun a major campaign to solve a longstanding problem. The first year of this work has proved that we are on the right road, but we still have far to go.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 1966.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILL SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

**LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING
TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE
MORNING BUSINESS**

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1107, H.R. 13365.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**DISPOSAL OF METALLURGICAL
GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE
NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL
STOCKPILES**

The bill (H.R. 13365) to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1143), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 885,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite ore now held in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of metallurgical grade chromite ore is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the ore is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite ore by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The material to be disposed of is excess to stockpile needs. The bill as submitted to the Congress would have permitted the disposal of 2,300,000 short dry tons of metallurgical grade chromite (chromite ore equivalent) which would include ferrochromite. The House of Representatives in considering the measure considered it unwise to authorize the disposal of ferrochromite at this time as such a release would be completely disruptive to the market. The committee concurs with the House in the regard.

The total inventory of metallurgical-grade chromite (chromite ore equivalent) is 6,244,712 short dry tons. The present stockpile is 2,978,808 short dry tons. The excess of 3,274,712 short dry tons consists of 985,646 short dry tons in the DPA inventory and 2,300,000 short dry tons covered by H.R. 13365; 885,000 short dry tons of the excess is in ore form, and the balance is in the form of ferrochromium.

Metallurgical grade chromite

Metallurgical grade chromite is an ore consumed in the metallurgical industries, principally for steel products. The ore is hard and lumpy, with a small amount of fines, varying in color from browned-black to black.

The ore is converted to ferrochromium and chromium metal which in turn are used to produce alloy steel and other alloying agents. The addition of chrome to steel imparts qualities of hardness, tensile strength, and resistance to heat and corrosion. Chrome is essential for certain types of stainless and alloy steel, having important uses in the petroleum and chemical industries, and in internal combustion engines and marine equipment.

The United States is dependent upon imports for the supply of this ore. The major sources of supply for the United States are Turkey and Southern Rhodesia.

The average acquisition cost of chromite ores and concentrates was \$50.55 per short dry ton. The current market value is about \$30 per short dry ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the metallurgical grade chromite now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

**DISPOSAL OF ACID GRADE FLUOR-
SPAR FROM THE NATIONAL
STOCKPILE**

The bill (H.R. 13367) to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1144), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This measure would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 32,000 short tons of acid grade fluorspar in lump form now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in

the national stockpile when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of acid grade fluorspar is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the ore is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of acid grade fluorspar in lump form by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

As indicated above the acid grade fluorspar in lump form covered by this measure is excess to the stockpile requirements. The bill as submitted to the Congress would have permitted the disposal of 236,773 short dry tons of acid grade fluorspar now held in the national and supplemental stockpiles. Most of the acid grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground. The House of Representatives, in considering this measure, became convinced that the domestic fluorspar industry was suffering a severe economic strain. Mere authorization for disposal would tend to further depress the domestic industry. The House report further states that there was industry consensus, however, that the release of acid grade fluorspar in lump form would satisfy the current shortage of this type of fluorspar in the domestic market and would not upset the domestic fluorspar industry. The Senate committee agrees with the views of the House in this regard.

The total inventory of acid grade fluorspar held by General Services Administration now stands at 1,144,090 short dry tons. The present stockpile objective is 540,000 short dry tons, and in addition, 350,000 short dry tons have been credited to the metallurgical grade fluorspar objective. The excess of 254,090 short dry tons consists of 17,317 short dry tons in the Defense Production Act inventory and 236,773 short dry tons covered by H.R. 13367.

Acid grade fluorspar

Acid grade fluorspar is a crystalline or massive granular mineral containing at least 97 percent calcium fluoride. Except for a very limited supply of cryolite and the very low fluorine content in phosphate rock, fluorspar is the only source of fluorine for industrial use. Most of the acid grade fluorspar in the stockpile is a concentrate which has been finely ground.

Although the United States has been the world's largest fluorspar producer, domestic consumption far exceeds output and Mexico (principally), Italy, and Spain are the main foreign sources.

Acid grade fluorspar is used to make hydrofluoric acid. Important products requiring larger quantities of hydrofluoric acid in their production are aviation gasoline and synthetic cryolite. It is also used as a flux in the melting of aluminum and magnesium during alloying and in the refining of scrap aluminum and magnesium.

The average acquisition cost of the stockpile inventories of acid grade fluorspar was \$46.69 a short dry ton. The current market price is about \$45 a short dry ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the acid grade fluorspar now held in the national stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF BISMUTH FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13368) to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1145), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 212,300 pounds of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of bismuth is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and the supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the bismuth is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the disposal proposed is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of bismuth covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of bismuth held by GSA now stands at 3,812,315 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 3,600,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 212,300 pounds is covered by H.R. 13368.

Information on bismuth

Bismuth is a brittle, hard, and easily powdered metal. It is produced as a by-product from the smelting and refining of copper and lead ores. Peru, Mexico, Bolivia, Canada, and the Republic of Korea are the major suppliers of bismuth in ores and concentrates. Several other countries, such as Japan and the United States, are large producers of refined metals from imported raw materials. It is used for low-melting (fusible) alloys such as are found in a number of safety devices as plugs for compressed gas cylinders, automatic sprinkler systems, fire-door releases, electrical fuses, and ammunition solders. The other major use of bismuth is as an ingredient in the manufacture of a wide variety of medicinal compounds.

The average acquisition cost of the stockpile inventories of bismuth was \$2.134 per pound. The current market price is approximately \$4 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the bismuth now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF PHLOGOPITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13371) to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1146), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately \$3,765,000 pounds of phlogopite mica splittings and approximately 205,640 pounds of phlogopite block mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of phlogopite mica is based on a determination that the quantities of this material in the national and the supplemental stockpiles are excess to requirements and not because the phlogopite mica is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantities of phlogopite mica covered by this bill are excess to stockpile requirements. The total inventory of phlogopite mica (block and splittings) held by GSA is 5,288,239 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 1,317,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 3,970,000 pounds is covered by H.R. 13371.

Information on phlogopite mica

Mica is a group name for a number of minerals which have a characteristic structure permitting easy separation into thin tough sheets. Phlogopite mica is softer than muscovite but will withstand higher temperatures. Special uses for phlogopite block mica include insulating material in soldering irons and high-temperature coils, liners in proximity fuses, transformers, and heater elements. Phlogopite mica is obtained from the Malagasy Republic and Canada.

The average acquisition cost of the phlogopite mica planned for disposal was \$1.36 per pound for the block and \$1.06 per pound for the splittings. The approximate current prices for the block range from \$0.50 per pound to \$1.90 per pound, duty paid. There are no published prices for splittings.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the phlogopite mica now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF MUSCOVITE MICA FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13373) to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1147), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,772,000 pounds of muscovite block mica, approximately 528,000 pounds of muscovite film mica, and approximately 22,666,000 pounds of muscovite mica splittings from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of muscovite mica is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of muscovite mica covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of muscovite mica (block, film, and splittings) held by GSA is 66,581,281 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 30,200,000 pounds. The excess of 36,381,281 pounds consists of 29,966,000 covered by H.R. 13373 and the remaining excess is from the Defense Production Act inventory.

Information on muscovite mica

Mica is a group name for a number of minerals which have a characteristic structure permitting easy separation into thin, tough sheets. They vary from clear to black. Ruby muscovite has the best dielectric properties. Block mica is the thicker sections ranging from seven-thousandths of an inch upward. Film is split from block to a variety of predetermined thickness ranges. Mica splittings are thin layers of mica with a maximum thickness of twelve ten-thousandths of an inch, split by hand from block mica. There are three principal forms of strategic mica (block, film, and splittings) and a number of qualities and grades.

Mica is used as dielectric supporting elements in electronic tubes, mica capacitors as insulation in motors and other electrical apparatus. Splittings are easily bonded to cloth and glass fabric or build up into plates of any desired thickness or dimensions. Tape and cloth made from mica splittings are used

as insulation for field coils and transformers and other electrical coils and devices operating at elevated temperatures.

The principal sources of mica are India and Brazil.

The approximate acquisition price per pound of muscovite block mica in the national and supplemental stockpiles was \$2.60; for film, \$5.60; for splittings, \$1.04. The present market value per pound, depending on quality and grade range from \$2 to \$9 for block; \$1 to \$12 for film; and is \$1.20 for splittings.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the muscovite mica now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF RHODIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13578) to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1148), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) from the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of rhodium is based on a determination that there is no longer a need to stockpile this material and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The 618 troy ounces of rhodium (Rh content) covered by this bill consists of the entire supply of this material in the stockpile as there is no longer a need to stockpile this material.

Information on rhodium

Rhodium is a metal of the platinum group and is intermediate between platinum and iridium with respect to hardness, toughness, and melting point. It maintains freedom from surface oxidation.

Rhodium has a lower specific electrical resistance than platinum or palladium. Scientific instruments, jewelry, and precision instruments for the measurement of the physical properties of corrosive liquids are plated with this material. Electric contacts

plated with rhodium are used for radio and audiofrequency circuits because of freedom from oxidation and low-contact resistance.

U.S. production of rhodium is limited. The primary sources of the material are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Soviet Russia.

This bill authorizes the disposal of approximately 618 troy ounces of rhodium now held in the national stockpile. This quantity includes 173 ounces of rhodium in sponge form and about 445 ounces of rhodium alloyed with platinum.

The approximate acquisition cost of the rhodium is about \$126.54 per troy ounce. The current market price for rhodium in sponge form is reported at \$197 to \$200 per troy ounce. The platinum-rhodium alloy is in wire form and has no quoted market price.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the rhodium now held in the national stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF THORIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13579) to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1149), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 3,500,000 pounds (thorium oxide content) of thorium nitrate from the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of thorium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of thorium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of thorium nitrate (oxide content) held by GSA is 3,965,461 pounds. The present stockpile objective is 500,000 pounds. The excess of approximately 3.5 million pounds is covered by H.R. 13579.

Information on thorium

Thorium is used commercially with tungsten or nickel in electrodes in gas-discharge lamps. Some of its compounds are used in

luminous paints and in flashlight powders. It is also compounded with nickel to produce high-temperature alloys. The Atomic Energy Commission is a significant user of thorium in the conversion of fissionable uranium. The chief sources of thorium nitrate are Brazil, India, Africa, and, to some extent, in the United States.

The average acquisition cost of the thorium inventory was \$2.08 per pound of thorium nitrate. The current market price is about \$1.86 per pound of thorium nitrate.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the thorium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF AMOSITE ASBESTOS FROM THE NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES

The bill (H.R. 13580) to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1150), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 15,170 short tons of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of amosite asbestos is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national and supplemental stockpiles is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of amosite asbestos covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

Information on amosite asbestos

The total inventory of amosite asbestos held by GSA now stands at 55,170 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 40,000 short tons. The excess of 15,170 short tons is covered by H.R. 13580.

Asbestos is a name applied to a group of naturally fibrous minerals. Amosite asbestos is characterized by long, coarse, resilient fibers, which are difficult to spin. It is more resistant to heat than crocidolite or chrysotile. It varies in color from gray and yellow

to dark brown with fiber lengths up to 6 inches. The Republic of South Africa is the only commercial source of amosite asbestos.

Amosite asbestos is used in manufacturing woven insulating felt, heat insulation such as pipe covering and marine insulation board. The long fiber amosite is used principally in the manufacture of thermal insulation.

The average acquisition cost of the amosite asbestos was \$245 per short ton. The current market price is about \$241 per short ton.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the amosite asbestos now held in the national stockpile and supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF RUTHENIUM FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13663) to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1151), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 15,000 troy ounces of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of ruthenium is based on a determination that there is no longer a need to stockpile this material. Consequently express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirements for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The 15,000 troy ounces of ruthenium covered by this bill consists of the entire supply of this material in the supplemental stockpile as there is no longer a need to stockpile this material.

Information on ruthenium

Ruthenium is a gray or silverlike, non-ductile metal of the platinum group. It is alloyed with platinum and palladium to produce a hard corrosion-resistant metal. The high melting point, hardness, and brittleness limit the satisfactory working of ruthenium mechanically.

United States production of ruthenium is limited. The primary sources of the material are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Russia.

The approximate acquisition cost of the ruthenium in the inventory was about \$37.30 per troy ounce. The present market value is \$55 to \$60 per troy ounce.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the ruthenium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13774) to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1152), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,450 short tons of vanadium (V content), and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of vanadium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of vanadium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of vanadium (V content) held by GSA is 7,865 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 1,400 short tons. The excess of approximately 6,450 short tons is covered by H.R. 13774.

Information on vanadium

Vanadium is a pale gray metal with a silvery luster. It occurs in combination with other minerals or metals, including uranium and phosphate rock. It readily alloys with steel. When added to steel it toughens and strengthens it—forming hard carbides which are retained at high temperatures. Vanadium increases tensile strength without lowering ductility.

The greatest percentage of all vanadium is consumed by the steel industry in the manufacture of high-strength structural steels, tool steels, and wear-resistant cast iron. It is also used in combination with other alloying materials such as nickel and aluminum.

U.S. vanadium ore is mined principally in the Colorado Plateau as a coproduct of uranium. Other sources in the United States are South Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, and Utah. Foreign sources of supply are Fin-

land, Republic of South Africa, and South-West Africa.

The vanadium for disposal is stockpile quality material in the form of vanadium pentoxide. The approximate acquisition cost of the vanadium pentoxide inventory was \$1.18 per pound. The average price received for similar vanadium pentoxide sold by GSA in February of this year was approximately \$1.22 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the vanadium now held in the national stockpile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for assuring expeditious Senate action in these stockpile proposals. Their vitally important nature falls squarely within the national interest. These two Members of this body deserve a great deal of credit for giving the measures swift, yet full committee consideration and for seeing that successful action would be achieved today. To both go our thanks for their continuing excellent work in this field.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, U.S. Army, to be a lieutenant general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, to be lieutenant general on the retired list.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

APPOINTMENT OF THE HONORABLE BERNARD BOUTIN AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in public statements today, I have commended the appointment of the Honorable Bernard Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his selection over the weekend and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business with a vital interest in the stability and health of the smaller businesses of West Virginia and the Nation, I am gratified.

In my statement through West Virginia news media, I declared that I would urge the Senate to act promptly to confirm the appointment of Mr. Boutin, because his organizing ability and leadership talents are needed by the Small Business Administration.

Mr. President, I do urge early action on confirmation of the executive nomination of the gentleman from New Hampshire whom President John F. Kennedy brought into the Federal Govern-

ment as Administrator of the General Services Administration. In that position, Mr. Boutin performed vigorously and capably.

After a period of return to private enterprise, Mr. Boutin was brought back into Government, President Johnson having appointed him Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, where his performance was of high quality.

In my Public Works Committee and Labor and Public Welfare Committee duties—and in my service as a Senator from West Virginia—I have been privileged to work cooperatively with Bernie Boutin in both his GSA and OEO assignments.

I feel that President Johnson made a wise decision in selecting him to head the vital Small Business Administration.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1965, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION OF SAN JOSE, CALIF.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Human Relations Commission of the City of San Jose, Calif., relating to the granting of the right of collective bargaining to agricultural farm workers, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 3321. A bill for the relief of Patrick Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3322. A bill to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3323. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of certain civilian guards at the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3324. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONTROYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3325. A bill to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in

screw-worm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTROYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended. This amendment will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

This proposed legislation is important to the cattle producers throughout the United States. Considerable work has been done to combat this problem, but much more is needed as we look to the future.

Let us review the status of the program as it stands today.

SOUTHEAST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

In fiscal year 1958, a cooperative program to eradicate the screw-worm from the Southeast was initiated in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. The major screw-worm eradication work was completed during fiscal year 1960 with great economic benefits to that region of the Nation. The primary source of spreading infestations each year to States north of Florida was the overwintering area in southern Florida. This area is surrounded on three sides by water and to the north by a climate which does not allow native screw-worms to survive the winter. The presence of these natural barriers against reinfestation contributed greatly to the success of the Southeastern eradication program.

When major eradication was completed in the Southeastern States it was necessary to protect them from reinfestation. A line of inspection stations was established for this purpose along the Mississippi River to prevent the movement of screw-worm infested animals from the Southwestern States. Maintenance of this protective line required as much as \$750,000 annually in Federal funds without cost-sharing by State or local sources for 4 fiscal years—1961-64. The eradication of the screw-worm from the Southwest made it possible to discontinue this inspection line beginning in fiscal year 1965.

SOUTHWEST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

Cooperative activities were inaugurated in February 1962 as a 3-year trial eradication program to eliminate screw-worm flies in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and concurrently to determine the requirements and the economic feasibility for establishing and maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexico-United States border that would prevent screw-worms from Mexico from entering screw-worm-

free areas of Texas, New Mexico, and States north and east. This has been accomplished.

Maintenance of this barrier is considered to be a Federal responsibility because program operations must be conducted largely within the Republic of Mexico, with the consent of the Mexican Government. Because screw-worms from Mexico can readily migrate across the international boundary, the northern limits of the barrier zone must extend into southern Texas and New Mexico but the distance depends upon various seasonal and climatic influences. Moreover, the barrier is in the same category as the cattle fever tick buffer quarantine zone along the Rio Grande supported by Federal funds.

The Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1966 made available approximately \$2,800,000 for maintenance of a barrier. The major cost-sharing requirement for maintenance of the barrier zone was eliminated from the appropriation language. However, in keeping with congressional intent, the cooperators are required to continue matching the cost of production, irradiation, and release of flies needed to eradicate outbreaks in the freed areas north of the barrier zone.

STATUS OF SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

In the fiscal year 1966 agricultural appropriation bill, Congress made available \$1 million for the Federal share of full-year costs of a program to eradicate screw-worms in Arizona and California and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. The Conference Report No. 1186 on the bill stated that as much as \$600,000 in matching funds would be provided by State or local sources, making a total of \$1,600,000 for this extension of the screw-worm barrier program. The extended program was initiated with supplemental funds of \$100,000 provided under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. These supplemental funds made it possible to start eradication activities in May 1965 at about the time of heavy screw-worm migrations from Mexico into the United States, thus preventing the usual screw-worm buildup in Arizona during the late spring. This favorable position made it possible to eradicate the native screw-worm population from Arizona and in California in one season. Even though there are areas where the pest can live all winter, not a single screw-worm was reported in Arizona between December 15, 1965, and March 23, 1966. Department scientists have just completed a thorough review of field data and have determined that a period of 11 weeks of freedom from screw-worms is sufficient to prove that the native population has been eradicated. Eradication has been accomplished when, after a period of absence of cases, any new cases which occur must be introduced from outside the eradicated areas.

PROGRAM OF FUTURE OPERATIONS

With the eradication of native screw-worm populations in Arizona and California, the sterile screw-worm fly drop has been concentrated further south in the barrier zone to reduce the heavy na-

tive screw-worm populations in northern Mexico south of Arizona and, thereby, further reduce the number of screw-worms that can migrate into Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and other States during the summer of 1966.

For maximum effectiveness the barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean must be maintained as one operation. The maintenance of any portion of the barrier zone is dependent upon the proper maintenance of adjacent portions in order to protect all States.

The prospect of a continuing high annual cost to maintain New Mexico, Texas, and States to the north and east free from screw-worms, makes it essential to find means of reducing the cost and, at the same time, prevent the introduction of screw-worms into the United States. An extensive field survey of the situation is being conducted throughout the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone as far as the Mexican-Guatemala border to determine the problems. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

This survey is designed to obtain information not presently available relating to first, areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; second, natural population densities during different seasons of the year; third, favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; fourth, varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and fifth, economic losses in Mexico.

Preliminary results of the survey confirm our earlier opinion that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico is feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico at a fraction of the cost of the present location. After completion of the survey a proposed program, with estimated cost, will be developed for consideration by the two Governments.

The Department does not have authority to cooperate with Mexico in screw-worm eradication. Under Public Law 8, Congress authorized the Department to cooperate with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth eradication program. The attached proposed amendment would extend this authority to include screw-worm eradication. With such authorization the Department would be authorized to consider a joint program proposal, after which discussions would be held with the Congress.

Mr. President, I request that this bill lie on the desk through Saturday, May 14, for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 3325) to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, introduced by Mr. MONTROYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL RIGHTS ACT
OF 1966

AMENDMENT NO. 561

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in recent months it has come to my attention that important health, education, and welfare programs are being placed in jeopardy by an effort on the part of certain Federal officials to correct so-called racial imbalance in the States. I hasten to add that the Federal officials are not solely responsible because they are laboring under legislation, the provisions of which are vague and easily misunderstood. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of an additional title to S. 3296, the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. I request unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the ambiguities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is necessary to avoid further submission of Federal officials to the pressures of outside forces which have compelled them to perform quasi-judicial functions and to allow them to concentrate on their statutory duty.

At the outset, I want to emphasize that this amendment is not intended to change the intent of Congress in enacting title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. On the contrary, it is designed to implement that intent. It is not designed to diminish the decisions of the Federal courts; rather it is designed to rely on those decisions in applying the sanctions of title VI. Nor is it designed to permit unlawful discrimination—it only assists in defining such discrimination.

My amendment would redesignate title VI of S. 3296 as title VII thereof, and redesignate sections 601 and 602 thereof as sections 701 and 702, respectively. Immediately after title V the following new title is inserted: title VI—Civil Rights Act amendment.

This amendment amends title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It would provide in section 606(a) that no funds can be withheld under any Federal program until a constitutional or statutory violation has been committed by the recipient of the benefits of such programs. Furthermore, such violation must be established by substantial evidence.

Subsection (b) provides simply that in making a determination with respect to alleged violations the particular Federal agency must follow the same procedural requirements as in the case of all other administrative adjudications. In the future, the recipient of such benefits must be accorded not only notice of the intention to withhold funds but also the opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in its own behalf.

Subsection (c) provides that in order to support a determination of discrimination it must be shown that there has been an affirmative intent to exclude or the necessary effect of exclusion of individuals from benefits on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The purpose of this subsection is to negate the application of purely mech-

anistic and statistical criteria in the determination of discrimination.

Subsection (d) is a protective feature of the rights of potential beneficiaries and prohibits any Federal agency from exercising control over any school, hospital or other institution under the provisions of this title for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin. Furthermore, this subsection will insure that no class of individuals shall be deprived of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity financed or partially financed by the Federal Government.

Section 601, which is the heart of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, would be left untouched by my amendment. It provides:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The remaining, implementing language of the title, however, brazenly transfers to the Executive the lawmaking power of Congress, and in doing so leaves the definition of discrimination and the application of sanctions to the uncontrolled discretion of agency officials. Congress has meekly surrendered the control of the Federal purse strings to the "equal opportunity officer" of each agency which he may use to effectuate his own notions of sociological progress.

And what has been the result? Not only have many officials predictably taken full advantage of their new power, but indeed some have usurped far more than was given them by the act.

I will mention three examples in North Carolina, only to illustrate how this legislative and judicial power which officials have assumed has resulted in the distortion of the original Federal programs they are charged with administering.

An adult basic education project in Charlotte, under which 1,400 Negroes and 170 whites in a total of 91 classes were being taught to read and write, was threatened with termination by the Office of Economic Opportunity because of alleged de facto segregation and so-called racial imbalance in two classes. This threat, without complaint from any local organization or individual, was made under the provisions of title VI.

In another North Carolina city, a hospital is at this moment under threat of losing Federal funds because nonwhites do not comprise as large a percentage of the patient load as is the percentage of the nonwhite population of the city. There is no allegation of discrimination or segregation in the staffing, in employment, or in the assignment of patients to wards and rooms. The only allegation is that the local populace does not become ill and choose the threatened hospital according to racial quotas.

Finally, there is the example of the Office of Education integration guidelines recently published for the South. There is no pretense in the language of the guidelines that their purpose is to prevent either discrimination or State-sup-

ported segregation. The whole thrust is so-called racial balance in pupil and teacher assignment according to percentages.

These mindless threats and fatuous guidelines cannot be remotely reconciled with the language or the legislative history of title VI or with the unlawful conduct—as defined by the courts—that was intended to be condemned. Two brief statements confirm this.

The best authority on congressional intent of any legislative act is the floor manager of the bill, and the floor manager of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was the then assistant majority leader, Vice President HUMPHREY. In developing the legislative history and articulating the intent of the act, the Vice President stated in 1964:

While the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race.

The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools; it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems.

The Vice President meant that the act was designed to eliminate segregation by legal compulsion. His words echoed those of the Federal courts as stated in Briggs against Elliott:

It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided * * *. It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains.

Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

But in not one of the instances I recounted in North Carolina did the Federal official responsible follow either the mandate of the 1964 act or the mandate of the Federal judiciary, or that of the specific poverty, education or health program he was to administer.

In Charlotte, the poverty program official stated his purpose was to "promote maximum cross-cultural experience," according to his euphemistic, sociological jargon. The education of hundreds of illiterates, 90 percent of them Negro, was to be sacrificed to the overriding imperative of so-called racial balance. His integration program was of more importance than his poverty program. It was not those who administer nor those who voluntarily teach who would have been hurt—only those to whom the ability to read and write would have been denied.

If the incidence of sickness among nonwhites does not increase sufficiently and more Negroes do not come to our hospitals, so that, thereby, funds are cut

off, it is not the hospital trustees nor the staff that will be hurt. It will be the charity patients whom the hospital can no longer afford to treat and many of them are not white. Such tragically insane policies, which completely subvert the purpose of our health-care legislation, cause one to wonder if "all what's nailed down is comin' loose," as the Angel Gabriel said to the Lord in the great play, "Green Pastures."

Such a thought is surely confirmed by the new school desegregation guidelines. In them there is this:

The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether the students are subjected to discrimination in education programs.

And one education official, in explaining these obtuse rules, said:

Race may have to be taken into account in future assignments so as to achieve an integrated balance of staff.

These statements fly blindly in the teeth of every Federal judicial decision concerning equal protection of the laws handed down in the last 20 years—decisions which state unequivocally that race cannot be a constitutionally permissible consideration in the enactment and enforcement of Federal and State laws. To our Office of Education, the Constitution is no longer colorblind. On the contrary, race is the primary consideration in the ground rules of its great drive for so-called racial balance. In ignoring the decisions of the courts, the guidelines equally ignore the intent of title VI. In fact, the sudden emphasis on so-called racial balance among classroom teachers violates the express language of section 604, which States that nothing in the title shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

And, again, who is hurt when a school system fails to achieve a so-called balance satisfactory to Federal officials? Not the school board; not the teacher. The only ones who lose are the students whom the Federal aid to education was designed to help and who have no control whatsoever over assignment policies. Yet the Federal Government would deny to those legally helpless students the equal protection and equal assistance which Federal law provides to all others.

As education bills are brought up in this body, we are admonished time and again that Federal control of schools is not the intention. I have accepted the assurances in good faith. Just last week the Vice President assured us that Federal aid was intended to—and should—strengthen local school systems. I accept this too. But, Mr. President, this is not the current course of Federal aid, for the program has been twisted into a club held over the heads of all southern school officials and used to enforce Washington's notions of acceptable integration progress.

The amendment I introduce today will prohibit such nonsensical interpretations of their own power under title VI as some Federal officials have divined. It

will accomplish this by defining section 601 according to the intent of Congress, and the decisions of the Federal courts; if it is adopted, title VI, in the future, will be implemented according to the intention of Congress and not the whim of bureaucrats who are not answerable to the people for their sociological follies.

If my amendment is adopted, every American will be subject to the same guidelines and can ascertain what those guidelines are. No longer will "discrimination" mean something different in 1 year from what it means in the next as is presently the case. No longer can the title be applied in one section of the country and not in another, without the protections of due process, as is presently the case. No longer will free choice be allowed by one department or agency and not by another, as is presently the case.

Mr. President, I ask all Senators to consider this amendment carefully, for I intend to press it. I am confident that fundamental fairness and equal justice require its enactment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 561) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 35, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI—CIVIL RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT

"SEC. 601. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 606. (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue, any Federal financial assistance for any cause other than a violation of a provision of the Constitution, or an affirmative provision of a statute of the United States, which has been established by substantial evidence.

"(b) No rule, regulation, or order which may result in the termination of, or the failure to grant or continue, any Federal assistance shall be placed in effect unless it has been adopted after proceedings taken in compliance with the requirements of sections 4-10, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003-1009).

"(c) A determination under this title to the effect that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin exists, has existed, or in the future may exist, in the administration of any program or activity shall require a showing by substantial evidence that in the administration or operation thereof conditions or requirements are, have been, or may be imposed with affirmative intent to exclude, or with the necessary effect of excluding individuals from participation in the benefits of such program or activity solely upon the ground of race, color, or national origin.

"(d) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize any Federal department, agency, or officer to issue any rule, regulation, or order for the purpose or with the effect of—

"(1) controlling or regulating the administration or operation of any school, hospital, or other institution for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin; or

"(2) depriving any class of individuals of the privilege of determining voluntarily

whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity, or of the facilities of any school, hospital, or other institution."

On page 35, line 17, strike out "TITLE VI", and insert in lieu thereof "TITLE VII".

On page 35, line 19, strike out "SEC. 601", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 701".

On page 36, line 2, strike out "SEC. 602", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 702".

AMENDMENT TO S. 985, TRUTH IN PACKAGING

AMENDMENT NO. 562

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, consideration of the so-called truth-in-packaging bill, S. 985, has been prolonged in the Commerce Committee for a number of reasons, but it is now scheduled for further consideration at another executive session slated for tomorrow.

While there is, I believe, unanimity on the part of the committee that a bill is desirable to increase protection of the consumer and to make it more readily possible to judge comparatively between products in the same line through a rationalizing of weights and measures, there has not been unanimity on the question of how best to achieve this goal.

A central question revolves around the desirability of giving a mandate to such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration to prepare and enforce certain regulations in this field. The proposal presently before us in a committee print modifies the original bill by incorporating the voluntary standards procedure of the Commerce Department as a means of setting standards, which would then be incorporated in regulations of the agencies.

This, I believe, is likely to fail of the objective intended, since the end result is very much the same except for the interjection of an intermediate step. The amendment I am proposing I offer as a bridge between the very real needs of consumers for an effective bill and the desire of some manufacturers for maintaining the status quo. It puts a greater responsibility on the voluntary standards procedure, which was revised last December and which incorporates provisions for an active consumer role in the process, a role which is pleasing to the President's Committee on Consumer Interests. Under the amendment, the voluntary standards procedure would be the mechanism by which standards are set, but it would also carry an element of compliance through a certification of the adhering industry people, who would be eligible to display a "seal of good packaging practice" as a result.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed amendment may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an explanation prepared for and already circulated to members of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 562) was referred to the Committee on Commerce,

and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning with line 12, page 7, strike out all to and including line 7, page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Whenever the promulgating authority determines with respect to a particular consumer commodity that the undue proliferation of the weights or quantities in which such commodity is being distributed for retail sale is shown to impair or to be likely to impair the ability of consumers to make comparisons of performance or value including price, the promulgating authority shall publish such determination and the findings upon which it is based in the Federal Register. Unless within sixty days after the publication of such determination as to a particular consumer commodity, a representative group of the producers or distributors of that consumer commodity shall have requested the Secretary of Commerce to develop a voluntary product standard for such commodity under the procedures of development of voluntary product standards established by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 272), the promulgating authority may request the Secretary of Commerce to develop such voluntary product standard. The promulgating authority shall through such of its employees as it shall designate participate in the development of the voluntary product standard for the particular consumer commodity.

"(e) Whenever any voluntary product standard has been established and published as to any consumer commodity, the Secretary of Commerce shall transmit to the appropriate promulgating authority (1) a copy of that standard, and (2) one or more lists setting forth the names and addresses of the manufacturers and distributors who have then or thereafter signified in writing their acceptance of that standard. Each manufacturer and distributor who has so signified his acceptance of that standard shall be entitled to display upon labels affixed to, and packages containing, that commodity a seal of good packaging practice which shall be designed by the Bureau of Standards. The introduction or delivery for introduction into commerce, by any person of any consumer commodity bearing a label, or contained in a package, upon which such seal of good packaging practice is displayed shall constitute for the purposes of this Act a violation of this Act if such commodity is not introduced or delivered for introduction into commerce in compliance with the voluntary product standard established for that commodity pursuant to subsection (d)."

The explanation presented by Mr. HARTKE is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF HARTKE AMENDMENT (S. 985)
ANALYSIS

1. Substitutes new section 5 (d) and (e) for section 5 (d), (e), (f), and (g) (committee print pp. 7-11).

2. Retains provision for promulgating authority to make a determination that ability of consumers to make comparisons is impaired by undue proliferation of weights and quantities, publish notice in Federal Register. Addition: Federal Register notice would include statement of basis on which findings are made as well as the notice itself.

3. If industry group does not request Secretary of Commerce for voluntary product standard procedure within 60 days, promulgating authority may do so. In any case, it will participate in development of the standards through its own designated employees.

4. When the voluntary standard has been set, the promulgating authority will receive from the Secretary of Commerce a copy of the standard and lists of those who have given written acceptance of it. These will be entitled to a "seal of good packaging prac-

tice" to be designed by the Bureau of Standards, for use on packages and in advertising.

5. The voluntary standards are not made a part of the promulgating authority regulations.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENT

1. The section 5 procedures, despite incorporation of the voluntary standards process, do not eliminate objections to the old 3(c) procedure but make them if anything less acceptable. It extends the number of stages through which the process extends, and ends with the same result of mandatory standards.

2. There is an inherent problem in the fixing of mandatory regulations revolving around the possibility of innovation. In order to comply with the regulations once fixed, a company might have to be much delayed in securing approval and thus lose the market advantage of innovation. This has been a major objection from the beginning.

3. Present section 5 procedures open the door to long legal processes which could delay for a great length of time the effective institution of the regulations. The voluntary process is quicker, potentially.

4. Instead of the mandatory "stick" the amendment offers as a compliance inducement a certification "carrot" in subsection (e).

5. The voluntary procedure is highly approved by Esther Peterson's office. Its revision last December has made it what they believe will be a much more effective instrument for consumer protection. Its consumer strength is indicated by these facts:

(i) Initiation of the request may be by "any group of manufacturers, distributors, consumers, users, or testing laboratories" as well as State or Federal agencies.

(ii) The Standard Review Committee, which comes into operation after setting of a standard, under the regulations (Federal Register, Dec. 10, 1965) includes by definition "consumers or users."

(iii) The procedure attains flexibility through a Standing Committee, following standard adoption, "to receive and consider proposals to revise or amend the standard" as changing situations may indicate. Its membership "shall have an equal balance among producers, distributors, users and consumers" together with "other important interests" such as State or Federal agencies.

6. Standards under the Procedures are voluntary, but the addition of the certification provision leads to signature by those who conform, a binding signature whose violation constitutes "a violation of this act." The result is, to a considerable degree, a self-enforcing standard.

MANDATORY PROVISION CAN BE ADDED IF
VOLUNTARY PROCEDURE FAILS

1. Legislative oversight is provided (sec. 8) by reports from the Secretary of Commerce to Congress. (While not a part of the prepared amendment, it is suggested that the January report should cover the preceding calendar rather than fiscal year as now stated.)

Fear has been expressed that interminable delay might ensue after the calling of a standard-setting conference, failure for 2 or 3 or more years to do more than meet and fall to agree.

The January 1968, report to Congress should reveal whether this is happening. If so, it is then possible to amend the law to incorporate the deleted mandatory promulgating authority action now in the committee print.

2. There is no question now but that action is essential in the areas of consumer abuse. The affected companies are aware of this, and would prefer to act on their own even under the prod of aroused public opinion and the threat of Federal mandate than to have the standards set by predomi-

nantly Federal action. The procedure proposed in the amendment will preserve that freedom, but by indicating (as should be done in the committee report and legislative history) that stronger action will follow the failure of voluntary opportunity, together with the certifying provisions of (e), there will be provided very strong incentives for the success of the voluntary procedure.

SUMMARY

In sum, by adopting the proposed resolution we will effectively stimulate the consumer protection we seek, but will do so while retaining the greatest possible freedom—with the background threat of compulsion if this voluntary opportunity is not fulfilled by the industry people.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO
LIE ON THE DESK FOR ADDI-
TIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3303, introduced by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and lying at the desk for cosponsors, be permitted to remain at the desk through Wednesday, May 11.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL MILK BILL HEARINGS
SCHEDULED FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, most of my Senate colleagues are aware of the fight I have been making daily on the floor of the Senate to save the special milk program for schoolchildren. Every working Senate day since we convened in January I have spoken out on this floor against the administration's proposed 80 percent cutback in the school milk program.

This fight is definitely beginning to produce results. I was gratified when 67 of my fellow Senators joined me in sponsoring a bill to make the school milk program permanent. This legislation also increased Federal funding for the program.

I was heartened the week before last when the House of Representatives decided to appropriate \$103 million for the program in the face of the administration's suggestion that funds for the program be cut by 80 percent to \$21 million. Although I intend to work for an increase in that figure as a member of the Appropriations Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee this is an excellent beginning.

However, it is only a beginning. Unless my bill to make the school milk program permanent is passed, the present program will expire on June 30, 1967. Of course, it is possible that legislation similar to mine could be introduced in the 90th Congress—next year—considered and passed by both Houses, and signed into law by June 30, 1967. However we all know how difficult it is to expedite action at the start of a new Congress with its multitude of housekeeping chores.

This is why I am especially pleased to be able to report that the Holland Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee will be holding hearings on this legislation on Thursday and Friday

of this week. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator HOLLAND has been a valued friend of the school milk program over the years. He has consistently supported amendments that have been introduced in subcommittee to give the program enough funds to meet anticipated growth. Now he has once again shown his strong support for the school milk program by scheduling these hearings despite a very crowded and hectic schedule.

Mr. President, I hope that some of those cosponsoring S. 2921 will see fit to appear in person, or file a statement, in support of the legislation. This would be a great help in insuring speedy Senate action.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2512, THE NOLO CONTENDERE BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will begin hearings on S. 2512, the nolo contendere bill, on Wednesday, May 11. Additional hearings will be held later in the session. Those wishing to testify on the bill should notify Thomas C. Williams, assistant counsel for the subcommittee.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held on S. 3296, the administration's Civil Rights Act of 1966, and six other civil rights bills as follows:

S. 2923, providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes.

S. 3170, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes.

S. 2846, to protect civil rights by providing that it shall be a Federal offense to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any of his civil rights; by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes.

S. 2845, to provide for the selection of qualified persons to serve as jurors in each U.S. district court without regard to their race or color.

S. 1654, to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, to specify the punishment if personal injury or death results from a violation of such sections.

S. 1497, to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence, and for other purposes.

The hearings are scheduled to begin June 2, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to the bills should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach has been invited to be the subcommittee's first witness. Other witnesses who will be invited will include Governors of the 50 States, Members of the Senate, public school officials, representatives of civil rights organizations, representatives of the real estate trade, experts in constitutional law, and other interested persons.

It is the subcommittee's intention to obtain the testimony of the best qualified experts representing a cross section of opinion on these bills. I am confident that, with careful consideration, we can compile a record upon which the Senate can base an intelligent debate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3169) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special program for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and physically handicapped spouses and children of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following concurrent resolutions and resolutions:

Authority of April 27, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities: Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Authority of April 28, 1966:

S. Res. 252. Resolution extending birthday greetings to the Honorable Harry S. Truman upon the occasion of his 82d birthday: Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr.

RIBICOFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of May 3, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution providing that no Federal agency take any action to discourage parity prices for any agricultural commodity: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. MORTON.

S. Res. 256. Resolution relating to United States denunciation of the Warsaw Convention: Mr. BASS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

Statement by him regarding the artificial water recharge system of Minot, N. Dak.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech delivered at Widen (W. Va.) Arts and Crafts Fair, May 7, 1966.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE IN VIETNAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the outstanding and truly excellent medical care being provided Army personnel in Vietnam under the high standards laid down by the Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton.

The U.S. Army Medical Service in Vietnam has the mission of providing effective medical support to the U.S. Army troops and other U.S. military and civilian personnel in Vietnam.

In accomplishing this mission the U.S. Army is proving that it is one of the finest military medical teams in the world. Complete, close, and continuous medical care and treatment are provided to all supported military and civilian personnel. The members of this dedicated team of highly trained professional and technical personnel are located at all echelons of command from the forward combat areas to the most rearward enclaves, insuring that our most precious commodity, the individual soldier, is provided immediately responsive, effective care and treatment.

The soldier wounded in Vietnam has the benefit of methods and materials far superior to those available a few years ago. The mortality among the wounded reaching a hospital in Vietnam is the lowest in history. In January 1966, it was 2.8 percent, of which the majority occurred within 24 hours of hospitalization. The mortality rate after 24 hours was only 1.2 percent. These splendid data may be attributed to many factors involving planning, logistics, and profes-

sional capabilities. I will mention a few of these factors.

Helicopter evacuation is used for practically all of the casualties for transportation to a hospital. The more seriously wounded usually reach a hospital within 1 to 2 hours after wounding and have been known to reach a hospital in less than an hour. This is exceedingly important in the overall low mortality rate.

Whole blood is available in abundant quantity, not only in hospitals but in division clearing stations and at times even in battalion aid stations. Infusion of blood for the critically wounded continues during helicopter evacuation to a hospital.

There are adequate numbers of fully trained general and surgical specialty surgeons, the great majority of whom are career officers, trained in the programs of the Army Medical Service, and therefore familiar with working within the military framework so that each is familiar with the primary mission of the surgeon in a combat zone and the indicated staging of the surgery of the battle wounded.

At least one, and in some hospitals two and three, well trained anesthesiologists provide anesthesia for the critically injured during surgery, aid in preoperative resuscitation, and participate in the postoperative treatment in the recovery or intensive care units.

Our most significant disease problem in Vietnam today is that of malaria. The incidence of this disease increased last fall concurrent with the buildup in troop strengths in Vietnam. The malaria encountered in Vietnam has demonstrated decreased susceptibility to treatment with synthetic antimalarial drugs. Fortunately, these cases usually respond to further treatment with quinine. As a result of this experience we have embarked on an all-out effort to find new drugs that will be effective in the suppression and treatment of malaria. New regimens are also being tested and a multimillion-dollar research effort is well underway.

United States combat troops in Vietnam are a highly mobile force which operate in and out of very restrictive terrain. Casualties resulting from these operations must be evacuated by a responsive mobile force capable of operating in the same terrain and under the same conditions. The Army Medical Service is meeting this challenge with helicopter air ambulance units in direct support of the combat soldier. Casualty pickups are being made at the place where the injury is incurred and many times while the combat operations are still in progress. The fact that a soldier can be evacuated from the place of injury to a medical treatment facility within minutes not only helps the morale of the fighting man, but has been one of the important factors in reducing the mortality rate to the lowest of any war in history. Approximately 90 percent of all casualties in Vietnam are evacuated by helicopter. Army Medical Service helicopters are averaging over 4,000 patient evacuations per month. Vietnam helicopter evacuations have already surpassed the total helicopter evacuations made during the entire Korean war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, General Heaton and all his associates are to be highly commended for their splendid work in this field. The Army Medical Service personnel in Vietnam deserve special tribute and commendation for their dedicated service. It is because of their work that General Heaton was able to assure me that "no U.S. Army soldier in Vietnam today lacks required care and treatment."

General Heaton is not only a truly great administrator, he is an outstanding active surgeon and a highly dedicated soldier and American.

All Americans, and particularly our fighting men in Vietnam and their loved ones at home, can be reassured and comforted by the high standards of medical care being provided and by the fact that no avenue of medical support is being overlooked or left unattended.

Mr. President, if I may have one additional minute, I wish to point out that excellent medical support not only exists in Vietnam and the immediate supporting hospitals in the Pacific area, but the more severely wounded are returned to the continental United States and placed in hospitals all over the Pacific side of this country, as well as back here in Walter Reed and other hospitals in the United States, where several hundred of them are now receiving excellent attention.

Let me point out quickly that the Army is not the only one. These exceptional medical services are found in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, and they do a splendid job. It does happen that in the war in Vietnam the Army is carrying a greater part of the load because they are the ones in combat and also because to a degree, they are taking care of the men on the immediate battlefields. These things do not just happen. It is with the greatest pride that every American can look at the record and have the finest assurance that if their loved ones are in Vietnam, they are being very well looked after.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield gladly to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I associate myself fully with all the comments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Miracles are being performed today by the men and women in the Medical Corps of the several U.S. military services, those intrepid people who bind up the wounds of Americans who have fallen in defense of freedom in southeast Asia and around the globe elsewhere.

Speed and skill in medical treatment in all the services have reached new highs. Great new hospitals have been erected here and in the far Pacific. Mobile hospitals are in South Vietnam. Particularly on this occasion, I am glad to join the Senator from Mississippi in paying a full meed of respect to the Army Medical Corps, from the world-renowned Walter Reed Hospital in Washington to its selfless activities across the seas.

I have, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, particular reason to be acquainted with the distinguished soldier who is Surgeon General of the U.S. Army—General Heaton. He is a great American, a great soldier, a great physician, a great surgeon, and a great administrator, who has successfully discharged his responsibility over this farflung, worldwide corps with all its skills in medicine and in surgery by which personnel in the Army are miraculously cared for.

I venture to hope, on this occasion, that the people of the United States, and the men and women in the U.S. Army, may have the benefit of General Heaton's continuing service for many years in the future.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me to make these comments.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I certainly share those views and hopes with the Senator from California.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1101, H.R. 11439, be made the pending business at the conclusion of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President there will be no business on the pending legislation, but it will be the pending business tomorrow when those most interested will be on hand to take it up.

WORLD COPPER CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, historically, the mining of copper has been an extremely important element in the economy of the State of Montana, and for much of the West. Therefore, the status of the industry throughout the world is of considerable concern to those of us who represent the Treasure State. In the past several decades, the industry has been plagued by many boom and bust periods. The London market is far too high and I believe that a time has come to attempt to reach some form of international agreement on production and prices. It was with this thought in

mind that I proposed a world conference, on a recent visit to Butte, "the richest hill on earth."

I feel that there is a strong possibility that copper may be pricing itself out of the market because these inflationary prices are stimulating the greater use of substitutes for the red metal.

This situation has developed since Chile raised the price to 62 cents and Zambia increased its price to equal that of the London exchange rate.

Incidentally, according to the New York Times this morning, Peru has joined the parade. These are tremendous increases. This trend can be dangerous. If this continues it will be extremely difficult to maintain a 36-cent-a-pound price in this country while the rest of the world goes way beyond. Incidentally, I want to state that the domestic copper producers—Anaconda, Phelps-Dodge, Kennecott, and the rest—have been most cooperative with the Government in its endeavor to keep the price of copper from going out of sight. Releases of Government stockpile copper help to alleviate the U.S. situation for a time but, unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot increase production to meet demand. Other metals such as aluminum and steel can be produced at higher levels to meet demands but this is not the case in the instance of copper.

Stability in the market is a requirement for continuous production and stable employment. This stability means prosperity to copper-producing areas of my State, as well as in other sections of the country.

This is something that might very well be handled at a world conference to discuss the adoption of an agreement on production designed to avoid "ups and downs" in an industry which can thrive only on a stable production-pricing system. This proposal immediately raises questions of international cartels and violations of antitrust laws but I hope that the experts within the Department of Justice will understand the gravity of the problem and cooperate on this matter.

It would be my suggestion that the administration take the initiative in calling a world conference for this purpose. The stability of one of the major mining industries is at stake and, as always, its effect on the economy, as a whole, will be of the highest significance.

WE SHOULD OFFER DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the recent hearings on China conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations clearly indicate the need for better communication between the United States and Communist China. The Peking government has for 17 years ruled some 740 million men, women and children—nearly one-fourth of the world's population. The establishment of a workable relationship with the Red Chinese Government is one of the most important problems facing our Nation today.

China will be incapable for many years, if then, of developing weapons necessary to challenge our security. Nonetheless, it is the most powerful nation in Asia and in years to come will have a profound influence upon the kind of world in which our children and grandchildren will be living. There is probably no greater threat to world peace today than the threat posed by the arrogant, hostile Red Chinese dictators who are violently Communist in the Stalin pattern. Time alone will lessen the bitterness they feel toward the nations of the Western world that oppressed China and degraded the Chinese during the 18th, 19th, and around the turn of the 20th century.

The time has come for the United States to recognize the Red Chinese Government. Nations, like individuals, should not ignore the facts of life. Recognition of one nation by another never means approval of the ruling regime of that country. Offering diplomatic recognition and reestablishing our Embassy in Peking would be a step toward world peace and could not possibly bring harm to our country.

Today we must rely on our consul general in Hong Kong and on Great Britain, France, Canada, and other nations that recognize Red China to relay to us information about that government. Hong Kong, incidentally, was taken from China at the end of the opium war which England declared on the Chinese Government because the Chinese tried to prevent the English from profiting by traffic in opium to the injury of the Chinese people. At the same time, there are many vital problems facing mankind that cannot be resolved without direct communication with the Peking regime.

Our allies, including neighbors such as Canada, have recognized Red China and are prospering by trade with that country. In 1964 Chinese trade with non-Communist countries exceeded \$2 billion. Very definitely, American producers and manufacturers should be permitted to sell to Red China at world prices for gold whatever the nationals of that nation may wear, eat, drink, or smoke.

Throughout the cold war period that followed World War II, we maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. During the Cuban missile crisis when the late great President John F. Kennedy forced Khrushchev to turn tail and withdraw his offensive missiles from Cuba, the fact that we maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and that there was rapid communication between our President and Khrushchev helped avert a nuclear war.

We should continue to recognize the Government of Taiwan under corrupt warlord Chiang Kai-shek, who took over Taiwan and slaughtered some 17,000 defenseless Formosan men, women, and children. Should the arrogant rulers of Communist China refuse to open diplomatic relations on that account, their scorn would result in a propaganda victory for the United States.

In speaking out for diplomatic recognition of China, let us recognize the facts of international life and speak for that

generation of Americans who did not participate in framing our present China policy.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, in the May issue of Nation's Agriculture appeared a series of questions and answers under the heading, "Our Biggest Business Problem Is the Cost-Price Squeeze on Farmers."

Questions were directed to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also on the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report.

I ask that these questions and very illuminating answers be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Question. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and also the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, what do you think is the major problem facing the Nation's farmers today?

Answer. I believe our farmers face the same problems as all other Americans—the complexities of life in the atomic age, war in Vietnam, inflation at home, and an increasing dependence on a capricious Federal Government. But the greatest problem facing farmers is the continuing cost-price squeeze, which is preventing the agricultural sector from sharing fairly in the national net income and forcing a more dangerous ratio of farm debt to farm assets.

Question. What has been happening to farm prices?

Answer. Generally farm prices have not been moving up in proportion to other prices. This is shown by the parity ratio. In December 1960, parity was 81. Until February of this year, there was only one month when parity equaled this figure; and most of the time it ranged between 74 and 78. It rose to 83 in February of this year and then dropped back to 82 for March. According to the New York Times, the Secretary of Agriculture "expressed pleasure" over this decline and predicted that the average price of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year. I do not share this view.

Question. Aren't some farm prices stronger than they have been?

Answer. Yes. Using a ratio based on a 1957-59 average of 100, the index of agricultural prices published by the USDA shows that by March of this year the average for all farm products had risen to 112. This average figure takes into account 81 for food grains, 107 for feed grains, 119 for oil-bearing crops such as soybeans, 123 for meat animals, 108 for dairy products, and 110 for poultry and eggs. But it should be emphasized that the overall increase from 100 to 112 has not kept pace with the increase in prices for nonagricultural items. That is why parity has been so low.

Question. What has been happening to farm costs?

Answer. The index of prices paid by farmers published by the USDA shows that by March of this year (using a ratio based on a 1957-59 average of 100), prices paid by farmers had increased as follows: wages, 127; taxes, 165; interest, 232; seed, 110, and family living items, 110.

Question. Why has interest increased so much?

Answer. This is due in part to increased interest rates. But it is mostly due to the \$14.8 billion increase in farm debt over the past 5 years—from \$26.2 billion to \$41 billion.

Question. Why have farm costs increased?

Answer. A major factor in the increase is inflation. The purchasing power of our dollar has been going down. In 1939, the dollar was worth 100 cents. A little over 5 years ago it was worth 46.6 cents. It is down to nearly 43 cents today. When this happens, wage earners naturally ask for more wages. All of their dollars are worth less, so they need more dollars. And very often wage increases will provide a cushion against future slippage in the dollar. Some labor-management contracts contain an escalation clause under which wages automatically go up as the consumer retail price index goes up and the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. Price increases frequently follow.

Farm land prices have been going up rapidly, and inflation contributes to this. Some people invest in farm land as a hedge against inflation. Others buy farm land for speculation, figuring that inflation will boost the price and they will be able to make a profit, with only capital gains tax to pay. And these inflation-minded groups naturally compete with farmers seeking to consolidate into larger units. More debt, interest, and taxes are sure to follow.

Question. Who is responsible for inflation? Answer. Let me start out by saying who is not responsible. It isn't the wage earner who asks for more wages. It isn't the retailer who asks for higher prices. It surely isn't the farmer who seeks better prices. These are merely the symptoms.

Inflation is the result of the supply of money (including credit) increasing faster than goods and services are increasing. The foundation for this is laid when a majority of the Members of Congress vote to spend billions and billions of dollars more than your Federal Government takes in, year after year. One can blame the executive branch of the Government for asking for too much spending in relation to our national income, but the responsibility for doing so is squarely on the legislative branch of the Government, which votes the appropriations and the revenue measures.

During the last 5 years, a majority of the Members of Congress have run your Government \$31 billion deeper into debt, and this has been accompanied by \$51 billion of inflation. Inflation takes more purchasing power away from our people than anything else except the Federal income tax.

Question. Are you in favor of inflation rather than taxes as a means of the Government's taking away the purchasing power of the people?

Answer. There are few Members of Congress who would say they are in favor of inflation. What counts particularly is how they vote on appropriations bills. In other words, it's deeds and not words that count. I not only am opposed to inflation, but my voting record will show that I have voted against some appropriations measures and for reduction of others in an effort to stop deficit spending.

Question. Why are you opposed to inflation?

Answer. Because it is the unfair way to take purchasing power away from people. It hurts those the most who can least afford to bear it—especially our younger people, who find the costs of higher education going up, the expense of maintaining a young and growing family harder to meet, and the cost of buying a home and going into farming or a business most discouraging; and our older citizens living on fixed pensions, insurance, and savings.

Agriculture, which is a basic industry, is usually damaged more by inflation than any other. I realize that my views are not shared

by those who classify themselves as members of the "new economics" school of thought; but I refuse to accept the theory that we have to have inflation in order to prosper.

Question. Are you opposed to increasing expenditures of the Federal Government?

Answer. With our increasing population, we can expect the total of Federal expenditures to increase. I am more concerned about bringing revenue and expenditures into a reasonable balance, so that the foundation for further inflation will not be laid. However, there is no question but what some Federal expenditures are excessive. For example, it has recently been revealed through the efforts of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, that it cost the taxpayers \$11,251 per enrollee in the Job Corps for the year 1965—this in the face of an estimated cost of \$4,500 per enrollee at the time the program was being debated in Congress 2 years ago. Many of us voted against the program—even with the \$4,500 figure—because we represent parents who are having a difficult time raising \$1,500 a year to send children through college.

Question. What can farm organizations do about the cost-price squeeze?

Answer. They can promote more efficient farming practices, research, and improved marketing of farm products. They can, through testimony before the Congress by their representatives and, particularly, through contacts (personally and by letter) by their members with Senators and Congressmen, assist in the very important task of moulding sound farm legislation.

A good many farm organizations, of course, provide cooperative purchasing and marketing activities for their members; and many of these have been highly successful.

Question. What can individual farmers do about the cost-price squeeze?

Answer. Most farmers are doing a good job of farm management now. They must, of course, remain alert to changing conditions and practices. They ought to support a farm organization whose policies they generally agree with, because organized effort is the most effective. However, they should always remember that their Congressmen and Senators are responsible to them and that good letters, setting forth the writer's own views, are effective. If more voters would keep an eye on the voting records of their Congressmen and Senators with respect to deficit spending, we wouldn't be having inflation.

L.B.J. WISE TO HOLD OFF ON TAX HIKE RECOMMENDATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these who have been critical of the administration for not calling for a big across-the-board tax increase should take a long hard look at the George Shea column in this morning's Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Shea makes an impressive case that inflation may be going through its last gasps.

Of course, the future is always cloudy. None of us can predict with real assurance. But the hard facts of basic commodity prices—especially those that normally lead price performance generally—suggest that those who flatly predict a big inflation are likely to be wrong.

Also, as Shea points out, the bond market has been dropping steadily and is near a record low. The stock market has been falling—some 90 points on the Dow-Jones index since last February.

Heaven knows, this kind of performance is anything but inflationary.

Mr. Shea is especially telling when he writes:

Nor are the downward-pointing signs confined to securities. Some commodities have turned down too. Although statistics of copper supply and demand still suggest there is a real shortage of the metal, its price in the free London market has fallen from the equivalent of more than 90 cents a pound earlier this year to below 70 cents.

The price of lead last week was reduced here, likewise to adjust to a decline in London. A Government index of so-called sensitive industrial commodities—staples which tend to move up or down earlier than other commodities—is down below 119 percent of the 1957-59 average from a high of 125 percent reached in mid-March. And the Dow-Jones index of commodity future, after touching a high above 140 in January was below 135 last week. The Dow-Jones index of spot prices is still close to the year's high reached in April, but spot prices are normally responsive to current supply-and-demand conditions, whereas futures represent an attempt by traders to read the trends that lie ahead.

Mr. Shea points out that the housing construction industry has been declining for a couple of years—and seems unlikely to recover vigorously in the face of tight money, that in spite of widespread predictions of a bigger auto year than ever, fewer autos were sold in April this year than last.

Sure, the eminence of the economists lined up for a tax increase is impressive. But Senators should not forget that the economic future can rarely be foreseen clearly, and now the indicators are especially mixed.

All of which once again underlines the wisdom of the administration's policy of caution, of hammering where it can to keep prices down—but avoiding what could turn into an economic catastrophe—a big tax increase just as prices are about to level off and the economy is about to slack off anyway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Shea be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The debate over whether the Federal tax bite should be increased in order to fight inflation makes the business headlines almost daily. Almost no one seems to recognize the possibility that actually a turn toward deflation may already have started, or that the policy question to be determined soon will be what to do if the deflation becomes severe.

True, the debaters do see ultimate deflation as the danger. That is, those who want to raise taxes say, in effect, that the inflationary trend needs to be curbed lest it get so out of hand that severe deflationary measures will have to be taken, leading to a serious recession. The opposite view is that the inflationary trend isn't strong enough to require a tax boost and that a tax boost might bring on a recession right away. But both agree there is a clearly inflationary trend now.

Of course, there are many signs of continuing boom. Wages and numerous prices are still going up, industrial production rises month after month, new orders are at record highs, employment is also a record, and such all-embracing figures as total personal income and gross national production expand

ceaselessly. But the number of signs that point to deflation is surprisingly large.

One such sign is the past year's decline in the bond market, with its accompanying rise in interest charges borrowers must pay. As has been shown in this space previously, such declines in the past have usually been followed by downturns in both the stock market and business. Furthermore, the latest drop in bond prices has pushed interest rates to the highest levels in 40 years or more. Such a severe movement can hardly be disregarded.

There is a tendency to discount its importance because some banking figures seem favorable, notably the trend of loans and of the Nation's money supply. The money supply consists of currency in people's pockets and demand deposits in commercial banks, and except during the first 2 months of this year it's been rising strongly for a good many months. Rising money normally accompanies rising business.

But the rise in money supply reflects rising loans. When banks make such loans they do it by setting up new deposits for borrowers. And the rising loans, by using up the credit resources of the Nation, are the basic cause for the rise in interest rates.

In turn, a growing shortage of credit resources, which naturally is reflected in falling bond prices as well as rising interest rates, is the classic cause for the declines in stock prices and business which usually ensue. There can be shortages of credit just as there can be shortages of men or materials, and if they get severe enough they are just as likely to depress business.

Now a sharp drop in stock prices has duly followed the decline in bonds, even though business is still strong. The behavior of stocks is another of the signs pointing toward possible deflation. In itself it represents deflation of stock values.

Of course, it must be conceded that this decline at present is only about as steep as that of 1965 and is smaller than the one of 1962, neither of which was followed by lower business. However, neither of those declines was preceded by any such deep drop in bond prices as we've seen this time. The current deflation of securities values is more pervasive.

Nor are the downward-pointing signs confined to securities. Some commodities have turned down too. Although statistics of copper supply and demand still suggests there is a real shortage of the metal, its price in the free London market (which affects the open-market price here) has fallen from the equivalent of more than 90 cents a pound earlier this year to below 70 cents.

The price of lead last week was reduced here, likewise to adjust to a decline in London. A Government index of so-called sensitive industrial commodities—staples which tend to move up or down earlier than other commodities—is down below 119 percent of the 1957-59 average from a high of 125 percent reached in mid-March. And the Dow-Jones index of commodity futures, after touching a high above 140 in January, was below 135 last week. The Dow-Jones index of spot prices is still close to the year's high reached in April, but spot prices are normally responsive to current supply-and-demand conditions, whereas futures represent an attempt by traders to read the trends that lie ahead.

Furthermore, not all business trends are upward. The housing construction industry has been producing gradually declining numbers of dwelling units in the past couple of years. The last few months this trend has leveled off rather than continued to drop, but it certainly has shown no tendency to turn up thus far.

The automobile industry is another where trends are in doubt. Earlier this year auto leaders were predicting with no seeming reservations that 1966 would be another year of rising sales of new cars. Now that April has

shown lower sales than April 1965, with no special offsetting reasons such as were relied on to explain January and February declines from a year earlier, the industry's prognosticators maintain 1966 is going to be as good as 1965. That in itself is a change to less optimism.

These varying signs of possible weakness in the general economic background may be misleading, as were the stockmarket declines of 1965 and 1962. Let us hope so. But on the other hand they may prove to be forewarnings.

Yet the public attitudes of the economic managers reflect no awareness of these unpleasant possibilities. A similarly short vision has been noticeable at past critical turns in the economic tides, a fact which raises a basic question about the validity of all theories of economic management by central direction. Like the proverbial military generals, economic managers seem to have a tendency to fight the wrong wars at the wrong times.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY AGAINST INFLATION MAKES SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been widespread partisan criticism of the administration because prices have been rising for the past 2 or 3 months. Some economists and newspaper commentators have denounced the administration for failing in effect to slam on the inflation brakes.

Several times, Mr. President, I have detailed the many actions taken by President Johnson and his administration to stop rising prices.

The most recent evidence that price rises may be beginning to moderate, is not decisive, but it is encouraging. Prices may level off without the rough medicine of a tax increase.

One of the most thoughtful, concise, and competent analyses I have seen of the prospects for price stability has been composed by Prof. J. William Fredrickson, of North Park College in Illinois.

Professor Fredrickson brilliantly summarizes the reasons why runaway inflation is unlikely and why the administration's approach has been about right.

I ask unanimous consent that the Fredrickson article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THERE BE INFLATION? NO

The recent discussion of the state of economy in the popular press has for the most part stressed the danger, if not the probability, of serious inflation. It has been popular to criticize the Council of Economic Advisers for underestimating the degree to which expansion in aggregate demand to be expected and to castigate the administration for hesitating to call for an additional tax increase.

In collecting materials relating to this issue from a variety of sources, I have become aware that an alternative conclusion can be drawn from the evidence and that this conclusion can be powerfully supported. This paper is an attempt to state the case for the alternative conclusion in the strongest possible terms.

J. W. FREDRICKSON.

PROPOSITION

Price levels will stabilize and will not continue to advance at unacceptably rapid rates. An inflationary spiral will not get started.

The fear of inflation will recede. A further tax increase will not be necessary.

SUPPORT

1. Rises in the wholesale price index and the consumer price indexes originate in temporary conditions in limited sectors of the economy which are in the process of correction.

2. Other economic indicators point to the existence of soft spots in the economy.

3. The analysis of the current performance of the economy overestimate expansionary forces and underestimate contractionary forces.

4. Administration policy is probably more effective than it is generally believed to be.

EVIDENCE FOR INFLATIONARY PRESSURE

Widespread concern about the present danger of price inflation rests on four pieces of evidence. (1) Unemployment has fallen to 3.7 percent of the labor force. (2) National defense expenditures have shown the influence of the Vietnam war, creeping upward in the fall months and leaping upward by 10 percent in December of last year. The defense buildup is expected to proceed rapidly in the first half of 1966. (3) The wholesale price index rose from 103.3 in July, 108.9 in December and jumped to 112.0 in January. The Consumer Price Index in December was 111.0, up 2.2 over the previous December. (4) Surveys of business plans for investment in plants and equipment in 1966 are running well above last year and exceeding anticipations. A U.S. Government survey in January-February put the figures at 16 percent above last year, and private surveys have yielded even higher figures.

The analysis which concludes that inflation is a threat puts these pieces of evidence into the following pattern. The fall of the unemployment rate tells us that the economy is approaching full employment, which constitutes the limit of its capacity to produce goods and services. (Many economists regard a range between 3 and 4 percent unemployment as the practical benchmark of capacity. The Kennedy council of economic advisers set 4 percent as a provisional target rate—the lowest we can go under present circumstances.) When the full employment capacity limit is reached, additional spending cannot be matched with further increases of output. Competition for scarce commodities, raw materials, and labor will bid up prices and wage rates. This is the classic origin of price inflation.

With the economy at the capacity level, increasing defense expenditures constitute the additional spending which can begin to drive price levels upward. In this situation the sharp increase in the wholesale price index is regarded as the first sign that the process is beginning. The conclusion follows that the economy is on the brink of a more rapid rise in prices and beginning to slip.

The final push would be given by the sharp rise in business investment in plant and equipment projected in the surveys of business intentions. To pile this swollen investment demand on top of Government demand for defense in an economy already at the limit of its capacity will insure the development of an inflationary momentum.

Such is the case for imminent inflation and the basis for calls that taxes be increased immediately.

COMMENTS ON THE EVIDENCE

The four pieces of evidence may not be as significant as they have been made out to be. At least they bear alternative interpretations which reduce their weight as portents of inflation.

First, no one really knows whether an unemployment rate of 3.7, or 3.5, or 3, really represents the capacity limit of the economy. A few years ago we were told that structural changes in the economy had made it impossible to reduce unemployment below, say, 5

percent; the balance were unemployable. On the other hand we can observe the economies of Western Europe operating at unemployment rates of 2 percent or less. It is worth noting that while the rate for men, 20 years of age and over is about 2.5 percent, the rate for teenagers of both sexes is 12. Unemployment rates are also higher for minority groups, but both minority groups and teenagers have benefited more than proportionally from recent gains in employment. As the labor market tightens these groups will benefit still more. As it stands the labor Department has just said, "No overall labor shortage exists in the U.S. today but there are some imbalances between supply and demand." It should also be remembered that the labor force grows by a million and a quarter a year, so that the capacity limit is a rising limit which yields growing quantities of goods and services even with a constant unemployment rate.

Second, the impact of Vietnam expenditures can easily be exaggerated. Up to November 1965, monthly defense expenditures were scarcely above the figure for December 1964. They went up a half billion in December, about a 10 percent increase. As a percentage of GNP, defense expenditures continued a downward trend prevalent since 1962. For the figure was 7.5 percent of GNP compared with 8.4 in 1964. In the next 2 years it is expected to rise to 7.6. We tend to forget that GNP, is now about twice as large as it was during the Korean war; a similar level of expenditure would put far less pressure on the economy. (During the Korean war period defense expenditures went from nearly 5 percent of GNP to 13½ percent.) Whatever the degree of pressure exerted by rising defense expenditures, there is a school of thought holding that their impact on the economy has already been felt when the increases were announced last fall. If this is the case, the actual outlay of dollars will not have much more effect.

Third, the rise in the price indexes originates in and is concentrated in the farm and food sector of the economy. According to Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, "The largest single factor in this was an inadequate production of pork in the latter half of 1965 and early 1966. The effect has spread into beef, eggs, poultry, and so on." So the price signals have come from a specific condition in one part of the economy, not from general advances all along the line.

The gap in pork production is on the way to being corrected, and the effects of this will be in the leveling out of food prices and possible in some declines. As an indication that this reading of the price indexes is correct, the wholesale price index held steady in the March figures recently released. Preliminary figures suggest that April will also be steady or even down a little.

Fourth, while heavy capital spending does, of course, contribute to the size of a boom, projection of such spending by itself does not guarantee that the spending will occur. George Shea, of the Wall Street Journal, points out that several times in the recent past, actual spending has fallen short of optimistic early year estimates. He argues further that spending for plant and equipment moves with corporate profits after taxes and suggests that the trend toward higher profits is leveling off. The growing scarcity of credit and high interest rates reinforce the conclusion that projections of sharp gains in capital spending are less than iron-clad assurances that such spending will occur.

EVIDENCE OF SOFT SPOTS IN THE ECONOMY

So strong has been the emphasis on the evidence for a dangerous inflationary situation, that little stress has been given toward certain other indicators which point in the opposite direction.

In the private sector there are three pieces of evidence which bear watching as an indication of growing slackness in the economy. Housing starts are not rising with the rest of the economy in spite of growing population, and rising interest rates should have some effect in further slowing down residential construction. Seasonally adjusted retail sales have been wavering and have recently been down a little. Consumers have been saving a larger percentage of their disposable income; the ratio has risen from 4.88 in the second quarter of 1965 to 5.63 in the last quarter.

In the public sector the deficit which constitutes the stimulative pressure on the economy has been declining in spite of rising defense expenditures. In December 1965, net receipts were greater than Federal expenditures. For the first 6 months of 1966, rising expenditures will be more than matched by growing revenues. Fiscal 1967 (July 1966-June 1967) is expected to produce a virtual balance in the cash and national income budgets.

These indications of some soft spots in the economy support the notion that scrutiny of the evidence for inflation suggest: that while the economy is approaching the capacity limit it is not about to explode into uncontrolled inflation.

NEGLECTED POINTS OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Discussion of the current state of the economy generally omits mention of two propositions in economic analysis which point to elements of resiliency in the response the economy to increasing aggregate demand: The capacity effect of investment and the tendency of tax receipts to rise with rising GNP.

It is true that high levels of business investment in plant and equipment have a powerful effect through the multiplier on incomes and on the level of aggregate demand. It should also be remembered that the same investment increases the capacity of the economy to produce goods and services. The high and rising levels of capital investment in recent years have resulted in growing increments in the amount of goods and services available to satisfy increasing demand. This means that the next few months will see new capital installations begin to make their contribution to a growing volume of goods and services in response to the pressure of demand.

The tendency of tax receipts to rise with rising GNP is familiar to students of fiscal policy as one of the automatic stabilizers of the economy. With no change in tax rates, the growing volume of goods subject to excise taxes will yield higher revenues, as will higher incomes subject to corporate and personal income taxes. It is estimated variously that between one-fourth and one-third of the dollar increment to GNP will flow to Government in increased tax yields. As has been noted, increasing receipts in the first half of 1966 are expected to outpace the growth of expenditures, including Vietnam. The rise will continue in the second half of 1966, and the increase in total Federal tax receipts for 1966 is in the order of several billions of dollars.

POLICY MEASURES

Discussion of potential inflation and what to do about it has centered on proposals for a further tax increase as a means of reducing the pressure of aggregate demand on prices. Such an emphasis minimizes other policy measures in the modern tool kit of devices for influencing the economy and tends to overlook the delayed impact of policy measures already taken. Action has been taken and is being taken over a wider range of policy alternatives than is generally realized. The impact of some of these measures is only now beginning to have an effect, and some important effects may not show up for some time yet. A review of the policy meas-

ures now in operation suggests that current policy may be adequate and that it would be premature to impose additional restraint at this time.

1. Monetary restraint was invoked by the Federal Reserve Board action in December raising the rediscount rate to 4.5 percent, the highest in 36 years. Interest rates are at record highs. Banks are beginning to ration credit. Borrowers are finding it harder to get loans even at higher rates. The money supply is growing at only half of the rate of recent years. (Beryl Sprinkel, of Chicago's Harris Trust & Savings Bank, has shown a remarkable correlation between changes in the rate of growth of money supply and the pace of the economy.)

The results are beginning to show, and not only in the weakness of housing construction. A number of State and local governments have had to postpone or cancel projects because of the high cost of borrowed money. Consumer installment credit extended declined in February for the third month. These may be only the first indications of the gradual impact of monetary restraint; in the 1959-60 experience it was 9 months after the rediscount rate was raised to 4 percent that a general decline in business activity began.

2. Fiscal policy measures currently are aimed at removing the net stimulus from the public sector of the economy by arriving at an approximate balance of the national income accounts budget during 1966. Anticipated increases in expenditure are offset by increases of revenues from three sources: the impact of 1965 budget actions, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, and the normal growth of revenue at high employment.

Scheduled increases in payroll taxes for social security which went into effect on January 1 are expected to yield about \$6 billion in additional revenue. This would be partially offset by liberalization of benefits raising transfer payments by \$2 billion, leaving a net rise of \$4 billion in the amount drained out of the income stream. The 1966 tax adjustment would add another \$3.5 billion to Federal revenue. Together with normal growth of revenue at \$11.5 billion, the total additional revenue would amount to more than enough to offset the anticipated rise in expenditures of \$17.5 billion.

The 1966 Tax Adjustment Act is nicely calculated to produce its maximum effect early in 1966 without a change in the basic tax structure. Reform of the withholding system for individual income taxes, rescheduling of corporate tax payments, and placing self-employed social security payments on a more current basis will reduce disposable income by about \$2.5 billion during 1966 when the restraint is most needed. The postponement of the scheduled excise tax cuts for 2 years will restore nearly \$1 billion of revenue in the current year. These adjustments will have their maximum effect quickly during the period in 1966 when the influence of defense expenditures will be largest.

Treasury reports on the first quarter indicate that tax collections are running higher than expected and that the budget deficit for the current fiscal year could be reduced by a noticeable amount.

3. The wage-price guideposts have been an important element in the administration's policy mix for promoting stable growth. Although the guideposts have been under fire from both labor and business, an impressive case can be made for the importance and effectiveness of the guideposts. Such a case was made by Senator PROXMIRE on March 14, in which he outlined 10 situations over the past 4 years in which the public suggestion of standards for noninflationary wage and price levels had influenced the outcome. In addition he argues theoretically for the proposition that the guideposts are a policy instrument which can influence price and wage decisions of big labor and big business which

are not reached by monetary-fiscal restraint, but which often set the pace for the rest of the economy.

In the current situation the existence of the wage-price guideposts can help to avoid the launching of an inflationary wage-price spiral based on what may be temporary pressure on certain sectors of the economy. In the future as we learn to live with what is really a new situation—long-term operation of the economy at near capacity—they may become even more important.

4. A new element in economic policy is the effort of the administration to see that every Government action that can have an impact on supply or demand is coordinated into a broad ranging anti-inflationary campaign. The simplest way to support this statement is to list and illustrate the types of action.

(a) Stockpile releases. Aluminum, copper, and a considerable number of other commodities accumulated in strategic stockpiles are being sold to relieve supply shortages.

(b) Sales of surplus agricultural commodities. Corn from Government surplus stocks has been sold at an increasingly rapid rate in recent months. Prices have dropped since mid-February, and this is expected to encourage livestock production which in turn would help bring meat prices down.

(c) Government purchases. The General Services Administration has suggested to suppliers that substitutes be used for scarce commodities such as copper and leather. Defense procurement officials are examining their entire purchase list for possible substitutes, particularly food products, and have ordered a 50-percent reduction in pork purchases for consumption of the Armed Forces in the continental United States.

(d) Expenditure restraint. The President has requested that his Cabinet hold expenditures a billion or more below authorized budget levels.

(e) Food distribution programs. The Department of Agriculture is substituting margarine for butter in food distribution programs, thus releasing butter to the commercial markets.

(f) Export quotas. The Commerce Department has imposed export controls on cowhides that will hold exports at 11.5 million hides, 2.5 million less than last year.

In a sense these measures constitute an unprecedented process of Government letting its left hand know what its right hand is doing and getting them to work together in the interests of relieving inflationary pressure. Programs which have operated in the past to support prices are now being used to avoid price increases.

5. Another new element in administration policy is the concerted efforts of high Government officials, led by the President, to influence private decisions by persuasion. Speeches by Cabinet members, private conversations, presidential phone calls, and perhaps most significant, an early April White House dinner for 150 leading businessmen, have carried the anti-inflation message emphasizing the need for restraint in plant expansion. Post dinner responses from those present indicate that a significant number of leading businesses are preparing to reduce their investment in new plant and equipment from the levels originally planned. Since an unexpected large increase in planned capital spending is one of the principal sources of expected inflationary pressure, such a result could be of great help in avoiding the excessive expansion of aggregate demand in 1966.

The case for the proposition that there will be no inflation may be summed up as follows:

1. The evidence of the economic indicators is mixed. Along with signs of weakness in the economy.

2. The signs of developing pressure are concentrated in specific sectors of the economy, and there are indications that they

arise from temporary conditions in those sectors.

3. Two frequently overlooked aspects of our high growth economy will provide built-in contrainflationary forces: rising capacity resulting from high levels of investment in recent years and the normal growth of Federal revenues.

4. Administration policy for the control of inflation—the traditional monetary fiscal measures supplemented by guideposts, administrative action, and executive persuasion—is increasingly being recognized as forceful and well aimed.

POSTSCRIPT

There is even a case lurking in the background of this analysis for the proposition that after the period of maximum inflationary pressure subsides in mid-1966 there is a real danger of a slump. George Shea of the Wall Street Journal is sounding this note, and the U.S. News & World Report recently pointed to seven instances of business slumps following within months after the restriction of credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASHINGTON'S OPPORTUNITY IN TODAY'S AFRICA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Graham Hovey, who is a man I have known for a number of years, and who was a highly competent professor at the University of Wisconsin and commentator on the University of Wisconsin radio station in Madison, has had a very distinguished and interesting career. He served on the Minneapolis Tribune and is now on the editorial staff of the New York Times.

This morning the New York Times has published a most interesting, thoughtful, and helpful article written by him on our opportunity in Africa.

Mr. Hovey points out that we are winning in Africa, although it has not made news. Somehow, we always hear the gloomy side. He points out that in African country after country which had been hostile we are ahead, and that the Soviet Union and Red China have been losing ground.

As one African specialist says:

We are winning everywhere * * * we are winning in spite of ourselves * * *

Less than 10 percent of American foreign aid goes to Africa; this amount was down \$100 million this year from 1962 and most of it goes to four or five countries. Africa still accounts for less than 5 percent of America's foreign trade and investment. Of 20 countries getting 92 percent of all American aid in fiscal 1967, only five are in Africa; of eight countries getting 84 percent of American development loan funds, only one—Nigeria—is African. None of the five countries receiving 93 percent of what the administration calls "supporting assistance" is African.

They concede that the European governments should bear more of the burden than the United States in their former colonies. But they say that with no residual colonial interests the United States can encourage essential regional developments cutting across the borders of former British, French, and Belgian colonies.

This kind of opportunity is rare. This seems to be a good time for us to

move to try to encourage that kind of regional cooperation and progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful article by Graham Hovey be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S OPPORTUNITY IN TODAY'S AFRICA

(By Graham Hovey)

More by accident than effort, the United States at the moment enjoys its best relations in a long time with nearly every country of Africa north of the Zambesi. The standings of the Soviet Union and Communist China have never been lower.

Will Washington be interested enough and flexible enough to seize this opportunity for constructive actions to assist orderly economic and political development and cooperation?

Or will an administration preoccupied with Vietnam and understandably giving higher priorities to Latin America and an Atlantic alliance in disarray merely mark time in Africa until the next Congo-type explosion?

RECEPTIVE REGIMES

Specialists say the present opportunity in Africa is unusual and cannot last indefinitely. If moderate, pragmatic regimes in key countries, now receptive to discreet American advice and help, cannot demonstrate social and economic advance they will be swept away. And the next round of upheavals is likely to bring in extremist regimes, borrowing tactics and perhaps ideology from Peking.

Military coups in three important countries of Central and West Africa—the Congo (Leopoldville), Ghana and Nigeria—have brought in leaders who seek friendship with their neighbors and cooperation with the West. To the north, the coup in Algeria at least replaced a chronic revolutionary meddler and implacable enemy of the West.

COMMUNIST AGENTS OUSTED

In east Africa, Jomo Kenyatta has driven Oginga Odinga into the political wilderness and booted out some of the Soviet bloc and Chinese agents who furnished resources to the former vice president. Kenya pursues its own brand of African socialism, which allows a major role for private enterprise and investment from abroad.

Next door in Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, whose survival appeared doubtful a year ago, presides over what seems to be the most stable and most democratic government in east Africa, even if Communist China remains the biggest foreign benefactor for his 5-year plan.

"We are winning everywhere," exclaimed an American specialist recently, viewing African events in a cold war context.

"We are winning in spite of ourselves," said his companion, having in mind such facts as these:

Less than 10 percent of American foreign aid goes to Africa; this amount was down \$100 million this year from 1962 and most of it goes to four or five countries. Africa still accounts for less than 5 percent of America's foreign trade and investment. Of 20 countries getting 92 percent of all American aid in fiscal 1967, only 5 are in Africa; of 8 countries getting 84 percent of American development loan funds, only 1—Nigeria—is African. None of the five countries receiving 93 percent of what the administration calls supporting assistance is African.

Many Africans view the replacement by a career foreign service officer of the flamboyant but dedicated G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for Africa as merely symbolizing the decline, long ago evi-

dent, of official American interest in their continent.

African specialists want more of many things: American aid, technical and planning assistance, capital investment, imports of African goods, support for commodity agreements, and credits to cushion single-crop economies against violent price fluctuations. Above all, they ask for evidence of a more constant interest in the new Africa's problems.

They concede that the European governments should bear more of the burden than the United States in their former colonies. But they say that with no residual colonial interests the United States can encourage essential regional developments cutting across the borders of former British, French, and Belgian colonies.

With Kwame Nkrumah gone, a chain of friendly states under moderate leaders now stretches around west Africa's hump from Sierra Leone to the Congo. Here may be a unique opportunity for the kind of regional cooperation that alone can make some of these struggling states viable.

A recent First National City Bank study reported a "brighter picture of steady economic development" in Africa and added: "The majority of African leaders recognize the great need for private capital to speed development and are endeavoring to create or preserve an economic climate favorable to investment."

PREMATURE OR WRONG?

Last year for the second time a touring Chou En-lai called African countries ripe for revolution. The revolutions since then were hardly the kind Mr. Chou had in mind, but the question for which the United States will help supply the long-range answer is: Was the Chinese Communist Premier only premature or will events continue to prove him wrong?

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the University of Kansas has just concluded a week's program celebrating its centennial year.

Time magazine in a recent issue carried an article which truly and factually describes Kansas University, and I quote in part:

What strikes most visitors when they first go to KU is the beauty of the 900-acre, tree-covered campus, atop a hill called Mount Oread, curiously rising out of the prairies around the town of Lawrence. If he tarried longer, the visitor is impressed by the million-volume library, the small classes, the spectacular wildlife diorama that Kansas inherited from the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, the extension courses for prisoners at Leavenworth Penitentiary (favorite subjects: Abnormal psychology and sociology of deviant behavior), the big medical school in Kansas City, Kans.

Over the past 8 years, Kansas had harvested six Rhodes scholarships, almost as many as Princeton or Yale, and 106 Woodrow Wilson scholarships for postgraduate study in the past 10 years. An honors program exempts the top 150 students from classload limits, lets some students carry as many as 28 hours per semester and whiz through college in little over 2 years.

During centennial week, many outstanding citizens from over the Nation visited Kansas University and participated in the program. One of the outstanding speeches was delivered by Dr. J. Mark Hiebert, chairman of the board, Sterling Drug, Inc., and a member of the University of Kansas Council for Prog-

ress. The address is entitled, "Public Responsibilities of the Manufacturer of Prescription Medicines."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The centennial of the University of Kansas falls in a year that may be memorable in the annals of medicine and pharmacy, and of the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry of the United States. It will be known to senior citizens as the year when Medicare started. It will also be known as the year when, for the first time, more than 1 billion prescriptions were filled in the pharmacies of America.

This huge number of prescriptions symbolizes the responsibility of the manufacturer in his task of producing efficacious medicines of high quality and safety. These prescription medicines cannot be bought over the counter and can reach the public only through intermediaries—the experts, members of the medical profession. There is no parallel to this situation with any other commodity, in which the industry supplies, the doctor prescribes and the patient consumes, with the doctor figuratively watching over the patient's shoulder to evaluate the effect and the safety of the product.

One billion prescriptions is equivalent to five prescriptions for every man, woman, and child in our country. They add up to more than 8,000 prescriptions for each of the 120,000 registered pharmacists in the United States; and to approximately 50 prescriptions per day, every day of the year for the 53,000 community pharmacies. Think of the impossible situation we would face if, as less than a generation ago, each prescription—either original or refill—had to be individually compounded by the pharmacist.

These prescriptions represent America's biggest bargain for they bring comfort, health and life to itself to untold numbers. The entire billion prescriptions filled in 1966 will cost the American people only one-sixth the estimated cost of landing the first American on the moon.

Moreover, the cost of the billion prescriptions will be a prime investment. They will substantially reduce the economic loss due to illness. They will reduce to a fraction the cost of hospital care and of illness by reason of the speedier recoveries they make possible. In this connection, it may be useful to recall the testimony before a congressional committee given in 1959 by Dr. James A. Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health:

"The cost of some of these modern drugs is high, but it can be looked on in another way—that is, if you use these very potent drugs properly. Today I would guess \$3 worth of penicillin can be substituted effectively for 2 or 3 weeks in the hospital with lobar pneumonia, with an incidence of empyema in about 10 percent, and with a death rate of no less than 5 in the healthy young adult. No pneumonias are cured with \$3 or \$4 worth of penicillin," Dr. Shannon observed.

The ability to fill 1 billion prescriptions in a single year reflects progress in science, advances in medicine, discoveries by pharmaceutical manufacturers, sophisticated production technology and the availability and the professional skills of the Nation's pharmacists. Almost 95 percent of the prescriptions today are produced in their entirety by pharmaceutical manufacturers. Clearly, a billion prescriptions could not be filled if an overwhelming number of them required compounding by the pharmacist.

An interesting fact about these prescriptions is that they will include, for the most part, the 587 new single chemical entities

introduced in the period 1941-63, of which the United States firms originated 321, or 61 percent of the total. There has been a falling off in the introduction of new chemical entities since the new drug amendments of 1962 were enacted by the Congress. It is to be hoped that this is only a temporary condition.

There is much more to the billion prescriptions than quantitative statement. All of us have heard recitals of the diseases overcome in our time by men of science, medicine and pharmacy, working individually or associated with industry or with nonprofit institutions. Today's newborn child will happily miss most of the illnesses to which we were exposed. Some of them are cataloged by Sir Derrick Dunlop, the distinguished physician who heads the Safety of Drugs Committee of the United Kingdom. In the Harrington lecture, he said: "The advent of the sulphonamides heralded the therapeutic explosion in the 1930's. Since then the mortality from gastro-intestinal infections, the chief cause of infantile deaths, has fallen by over 80 percent and that from pulmonary infections by nearly 70 percent, while the mortality from tuberculosis, meningococcal infections, mastoiditis, and venereal disease all show similar or greater declines.

"Diphtheria, from which as late as 1940 there were 2,500 fatal cases in England and Wales alone, has disappeared," Sir Derrick continued. "Typhoid, typhus, tetanus, cholera, plague, yellow fever, rabies, smallpox, measles, whooping cough, and polio can be prevented; many tropical diseases such as malaria (once the world's most prevalent disease, afflicting an estimated 800 million population) have been controlled; and the lives of patients suffering from diabetes and pernicious anemia can be preserved and considerable relief given to sufferers from hypertension, arthritis, asthma, and many nervous and mental disorders.

"The list is far from comprehensive," Sir Derrick said, "and makes inadequate mention of the relief from suffering which the purely symptomatic use of modern drugs confer. Doubtless the all-round improvement in social conditions has contributed to these remarkable results, which since 1930 have added 10 years to our average expectation of life; but in this country (United Kingdom) the use of modern drugs, including bacteriological products, has been a more potent factor."

This from Sir Derrick Dunlop. Here is another view of the benefits of medical progress. It is presented in a study by Arthur D. Little, Inc., on the social and economic benefits of the pharmaceutical industry in the United States.

The report estimated that 4,400,000 people of working age were alive in 1961 who would not have been if 1935 death rates had continued. This means that in 1961 61 people out of every 1,000 in the civilian labor force would have been dead if the mortality rate of 1935 had not been reduced. The Little report noted also that "there are more than 2 million working age survivors (in 1961) who, if the 1935 death rates had continued, would have been a victim of just four diseases—tuberculosis, syphilis, influenza, and pneumonia."

The therapeutic explosion of our time has provided still other benefits. For example, two-thirds of the patients being admitted to mental hospitals today are discharged in the first year, a marked improvement over the experience of only a few years ago. And Kansas is in the forefront of progress in the treatment of mental illness. Today, through the use of modern drugs and psychiatric care, 75 to 85 patients out of every 100 admitted to mental hospitals in this State will be discharged within a year. This is even better than the national average.

It would be less than frank for me, a native Kansan and one-time student at the University of Kansas, to leave you with the misimpression that all is perfect in the wonderfully exciting and personally satisfying world of pharmaceutical discovery and manufacture. We confess to human fallibility; we have made errors—and I hope we succeed in omitting to make the same errors again. But I think we have a right to responsible perspective in the evaluation of our industry's achievements.

Please do not misunderstand. There is always room for improvement—in our industry and everywhere else. Criticism can be most helpful in guiding such improvement, but we ask, at the same time, for a fair and balanced appraisal of the values supplied by the health professions and the health industries. Presenting the American pharmaceutical industry as in a distortion mirror gives, at the very least, aid and comfort to our competitors abroad and to this extent lessens our ability to contribute to U.S. foreign exchange. Based on my travels overseas, it seems to me that continued attack on the American pharmaceutical industry is producing a decline in the opinion in which the American people are held by peoples and their leaders in other lands.

We appreciate that the pharmaceutical industry of today is quite different from that of a generation ago. We used to have botanicals, galenicals, infusions, extracts, mixtures, and pills. Modern drugs are highly potent. They can be, and often are, life-saving; but, by comparison with the medicaments of yesteryear, the margin between therapeutic dose and toxic dose is substantially narrowed. In the discharge of his responsibilities, the manufacturer of pharmaceutical products must never forget this.

Responsibility of the manufacturer, the subject of this paper, is a theme I have thought about as medical student, physician and business executive. During this period—which coincides, roughly, with what is often referred to as the golden age of medicine—the responsibilities of the manufacturer of pharmaceuticals have multiplied.

I have already referred to our fundamental responsibility for quality, efficacy, and safety, within the limits of practical possibility in the light of current technology. I should add that the judgment of efficacy cannot be left solely to the experience of a handful—even of specialists. Rather, it should represent the collective judgment and experience of the medical profession.

As to the manufacturer, he has a major function of creating through research more and more lifesaving and health-preserving medicaments, and ever larger assortments of products in order to increase the choices available to the physician and thereby to serve the individual requirements of specific patients.

He should bring to the attention of the physician all new developments that may favorably affect the health of his patients.

It is equally his responsibility to alert the physician to undesirable and unanticipated side effects, contraindications, new indications when permitted by law to do so, dosages and the like.

If product error occurs, he must notify the medical profession immediately; and, if safety is at stake, he must withdraw the product at once.

It is our responsibility as an industry to adapt our policies and practices to the higher standards made possible by science and technology, and to regulation by Government. This is the 60th year—the diamond anniversary—of the enactment in 1906 of the Pure Food and Drug Act. It was the first law of its kind in our country and represented the public's response to the quackery of the times. The subsequent enactments by Congress—the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act of 1938, the Durham-Humphrey law and the new drug amendments of 1962,

among others, reflected the public's increasing concern arising from the higher potency of modern medicines.

If the pharmaceutical manufacturer is not to be overburdened by statutes and regulation, he must practice self-discipline in his day-to-day operations.

Looking broadly at the national health picture, it seems to me that the total responsibility for the health of our population is shared by many—by government, the professions, the sciences, industry, the universities, the hospitals, all the health agencies public and private. In the exercise of this responsibility by all who share it, distrust must give way to faith, suspicion to confidence, prejudice to objectivity.

Turning to safety, government, industry, the professions and the public are properly concerned about the reduction of risk. I have already referred to the built-in safety of prescription preparations by virtue of their being prescribed for patients by expert intermediaries—the physicians.

There is, to be sure, an element of risk in every type of product. There is risk in every action of people. There is risk in life itself, from the moment of birth onward through the entire life span. It is urgent that risk be minimized to the greatest extent possible; but it is no more possible to attain zero risk than to find the end of infinity.

In fact, safety consists in the judicious balancing of benefits and risks. This judicious balancing happily resulted in the eradication of that cruel crippler, polio. Dr. Leonard W. Larsen, president of the American Cancer Society and past president of the American Medical Association, recently disclosed that early batches of polio vaccine were found to contain a virus that produced cancer in hamsters—a virus which has since been removed. But he reminded the American people that “in removing greatly dreaded plagues from the list of lethal diseases, we had to take chances that sulfa drugs and antibiotics would not subject patients to deadly allergies and other diseases.”

Safety has other dimensions of critical importance. Safety requires the courage to say “yes” to a new drug as well as the judgment to say “no.” The “yes” answer is urgent when it can mean safety from imminent probable death.

Individual safety is also the responsibility of the individual. Safety should be built into the automobile; but it is still the man behind the wheel, urging forward some two tons of metal and glass, that determines ultimate safety on the highway. There is no known way of eliminating personal carelessness by legislation. This requires education, continual education, of the users of many kinds of useful products having a risk quotient. Medicaments on the markets are acceptably safe when used as directed on the label or by the physician. Danger develops in one's own home when useful products—be they medicines, kerosene, powerful detergents, insecticides, whisky, even common salt—are misused or abused. Danger develops when these products—any and all of them—are placed where children of tender years can get at them.

As to the evaluation of medicines for efficacy and safety, the computer is not the final and perfect answer, useful though it is. What the physician feels and perceives at the bedside of his patient may not fit into the square, or oblong or round hole of the punch card; but his observations are often a surer guide to the usefulness of a particular medicament for a particular patient. In the interest of the patient—that individual so unique that there is not another entirely like him in the whole wide world—we must be careful lest the scientific pendulum swing too far in the direction of mechanistic technology.

The United States has an enormous pool of talent—in Government and in industry, in

the professions and in the sciences. Can the Government, without abdicating its statutory responsibility, avail itself of the skills of experts outside of Government to contribute to the appraisal of the therapeutic efficacy and safety of new entities on their way to becoming medicaments? Might not the outside experts have some advisory role? If a useful way could be found, the public interest, I believe, would be well served.

We have come two-thirds the way along the lane of the 20th century. In that period, life expectancy has increased by 75 percent, from 40 years in 1900 to slightly more than 70 years today. What can we look to by way of further extension of life expectancy during the final third of the century? The answer lies in what all of us—you and I, the lawmakers and administrators, the scientists and the members of the healing professions, and the public—do with the knowledge we have, with the talents and energies that reside in us, to increase knowledge and to apply it courageously and intelligently, to the art, the science and the joy of living.

I presume on the hospitality of Sir Derrick Dunlop's paper to close with this quotation from it, with which I heartily associate myself:

“Operating under the profit system, the pharmaceutical industry has made enormous contributions to our society. Indeed, nearly all the valuable new drugs of the last 30 years—penicillin and streptomycin are notable exceptions—have been discovered in the manufacturers' laboratories. Since the October revolution in 1917 the State-owned industry in the U.S.S.R. has not produced a single new drug of therapeutic importance. We must therefore be careful not to kill the goose which has laid so many golden therapeutic eggs by excessive bureaucratic restrictions—still less by nationalization.”

Thank you for the privilege of permitting me to participate in the pharmacy colloquium during the university's centennial observance, and thank you for listening.

THE HEINEMAN SUCCESS STORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are few industries in this country that have had a rockier or tougher road than the railroads. When a railroad is able to show a profit, it is rare good news; and when one shows an increasing profit, it is even more welcome news.

But when a road that has been a money loser is able to show sharply increasing profits, it should be clear that there is something like business genius at work.

This is the fortunate fate of the railroad that has more miles of track in my State of Wisconsin than any other—the Chicago and North Western.

The Chicago and North Western has enjoyed the leadership in the past 10 years of Mr. Ben Heineman. Heineman was born in Wausau, Wis. His hard and successful work have made Wausau and Wisconsin proud and grateful.

In 10 years as a top officer of the Chicago and North Western he has not only brought the railroad clearly into the black, with a healthy profit of more than \$16 million, but he has greatly improved the prospects for this railroad in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on Ben Heineman's remarkable job with the North Western Railway, which appeared in the March 21, 1966, issue of *Railway Age* be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. & N.W.'S SPECTACULAR COMEBACK: THE HEINEMAN'S DECADE-LONG STEWARDSHIP OF THE CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN HAS SEEN THE ROAD MOVE FROM RED INK TO LARGE SPLASHES OF VERY SOLID BLACK INK

Chicago & North Western and Chairman Ben W. Heineman complete a memorable decade together April 1.

And what a decade it has been. Investors no longer cringe when they think of the C. & N.W. shares in their portfolios. In the 10-year period, the road has gone from a very red \$5.5-million loss in 1956 to a solid \$16 million net in 1965.

Further, the turnaround in results is only part of the good news coming out of the new North Western nowadays. The road's employees, shippers, commuters and shareholders also have rising expectations from such assets as—

C. & N.W.'s plant and car fleet. It has respectability such as it has not had for years. Mergers in the making.

C. & N.W.'s commuter service. Record revenues and earnings in 1965 from the road's suburban operations at Chicago promise to get even better. Trends so far in 1966 indicate growing rush-hour and non-rush-hour traffic.

Diversification: Prospects for increased earnings from C. & N.W.'s entry into chemical manufacturing are very bright.

Ben W. Heineman himself. There are those who insist he is C. & N.W.'s single best asset.

Ten years at C. & N.W.'s have not abated one whit Heineman's conviction that the rail industry future "is unlimited and will eclipse the great railroading years of the 19th century." Perhaps more pertinent to what happened at C. & N.W., Heineman has a passion for dispassionate analysis and a taste for action based upon such analysis.

C. & N.W.'s drive to hold and reduce rates and to work out economically attractive rate-service-equipment combinations that make competition and gain tonnage over the long haul reflect that kind of managerial insight. C. & N.W. hunted for ways to reduce rates when many carriers were unsure of the approach needed to deal with shrinking profit margins.

GRIM NEWS AT C. & N.W. IN 1956

When the curtain went up on the new North Western 10 years ago, only the leading men in the cast (and possibly the shippers, among such onlookers as employees, shareholders, financial experts, other railroad men, and the public) felt a comeback was even possible.

C. & N.W. news in early 1956 was enough to discourage even determined optimists. Aside from the loss of \$26 million in passenger operations the year before, the road lost \$8 million overall the first quarter of 1956 and \$11 million by midyear. C. & N.W.'s

previous management, while making good moves—retiring uneconomic branch lines, reducing employment, dieselizing, buying substantial numbers of new cars, probing merger possibilities with Milwaukee, ordering bilevel commuter equipment and installing welded rail—had not been able to halt C. & N.W.'s downward slide.

C. & N.W. sought rate increases in the early fifties as an offset to ballooning costs, especially labor costs. None of it seemed to have had much effect on overall results. "Everything we did seemed to turn up two other things that desperately needed action," recalls a C. & N.W. veteran. "We were being bled at a thousand places by people and practices that were hard to get at."

SAVING PENCIL STUBS

The old switchman's tag for C. & N.W. (the Cheap & Nothing Wasted) was actually quite inaccurate. While saving string and pencil stubs was an art in many lonely Iowa and Wisconsin stations (a magazine carried a story in the early fifties about an agent at a one-man station who had saved two drawersful of pencil stubs from his work of 42 years), there was internal and external waste. It is now apparent there was outside waste because of missed opportunity as the road tried to pry apart the narrowing gap between revenues and expenses by seeking rate increases. Shippers weren't buying and the competition kept capturing vital chunks of C. & N.W.'s tonnage.

On the inside, C. & N.W. was a road that gloried in having the world's largest freight yard at Proviso (a yard that some experts figured was 50 percent waste space), and an LCL house that could house 700 cars at a time—for traffic that C. & N.W. handled at a substantial loss. Serious problems were getting more acute with every wage increase. C. & N.W. was already burdened with the highest ratio of wages to revenue in the industry. There were, for example, more than 500 crossing flagmen on the payroll. There were hundreds of one-man stations scattered over the C. & N.W. system that could not be economically justified.

The C. & N.W. annual report for 1955 is an interesting document. It noted that the board of directors had requested that the president call in outside accountants to audit the company's financial statements for 1955. "This was a forward step because no such audit had ever before been undertaken," the report told C. & N.W. shareholders. In the same statement appears what must be one of the most curious phrases ever to appear in a railroad report: "the board recognizes what is known in railroad circles as deferred maintenance."

GOOD NEWS IN A FOOTNOTE

That same annual report carried the best news beleaguered C. & N.W. shareholders had gotten in years. In a footnote at the bottom of page 2 appeared the information that, on March 2, 1956, Ben W. Heineman was elected chairman and chief executive

officer and that Clyde J. Fitzpatrick (then operating vice president of Illinois Central) had been elected president of C. & N.W.—effective April 1, 1956.

On that April Fools' Day in 1956 began a decade of C. & N.W. that was to see the road achieve a dramatic comeback, make Heineman a leading industry figure (he first appeared in the industry in 1950, as attorney for a group of Chicago Great Western stockholders) and make C. & N.W. one of the most publicized railroads in the country.

C. & N.W. MADE GOOD COPY

The struggle to straighten out the wobbly C. & N.W. of 1956 was chronicled in most major newspapers and financial journals—many times over. Even literary journals like the Saturday Review, Atlantic and Harper's have treated their audiences to highly entertaining (if somewhat simplified) accounts of the Heineman-Fitzpatrick struggle to right the listing C. & N.W.

Most of the stories, however, focused upon the merger maneuvering of Heineman (now recognized as one of the most astute industry strategists to come along in years), the rebuilding and success of the road's commuter service at Chicago, and on the 1962 Telegraphers' strike, when Heineman stood eyeball to eyeball with Telegrapher Chief George E. Leighty and refused to back down from his principles. It was a moment when Democrat Heineman, with his taste for books, avangarde art and all, made even the flintiest of the industry's conservative chieftains sit up and take notice.

One of the funniest (and sincerest) tributes ever given to Heineman came after the strike, in the Chicago Traffic Club bar. A portly, extremely Republican railroad vice president told his guests that Heineman handled the strike "just as well as if he'd been a Republican."

But, by and large, stories about C. & N.W. dealt with relatively minor aspects of the road's reformation. The business and financial press generally made much of the merger moves and the up-and-down progress of C. & N.W.'s financial performance and share prices. The newspapers focused primarily on the unusual news coming out of C. & N.W.'s commuter operations, merger talk and on the attractive human-interest angles that can be developed from such a complex, articulate man as Heineman.

SHIPPERS KNOW REAL STORY

Of the various audiences that have read about and watched C. & N.W. during the last decade, probably only C. & N.W.'s men and the road's shippers are aware of C. & N.W.'s larger and more important accomplishments in the last 10 years. They are the ones who know about the rate reductions, the new equipment, the improved schedules and services, the new power, the industrial parks, the new port facilities, the upgraded plant and the aggressive marketing that marked the new management's quest for internal efficiency and external effectiveness as a competitor.

Selected 10-year operating and financial data for Chicago & North Western

	1965	1964	1963	1962 ¹	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Operating revenues.....thousands of dollars..	227,589	220,811	218,923	196,961	218,117	207,282	213,350	215,127	218,483	225,787
Operating expenses.....do.....	181,152	182,075	179,093	169,218	176,849	178,580	182,887	178,234	186,670	198,211
Net railway operating income or (loss).....do.....	15,516	12,400	11,318	(6,257)	10,746	(1,298)	3,124	8,861	5,470	131
Other income.....do.....	7,453	5,684	7,035	8,861	2,582	2,832	2,445	2,288	1,987	1,919
Income available for fixed charges.....do.....	28,073	18,084	18,353	8,231	13,328	1,568	5,569	11,119	7,407	2,050
Fixed charges.....do.....	9,004	6,923	6,791	6,997	7,213	5,710	5,420	5,260	4,784	4,540
Contingent interest.....do.....	3,005	3,038	3,038	3,038	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039	3,039
Net income or (loss).....do.....	16,064	8,128	8,524	(1,804)	3,076	(7,111)	(2,890)	2,820	(416)	(5,529)
Average number employees during year.....do.....	14,423	15,252	15,883	16,075	16,505	17,311	18,229	18,449	20,933	24,795
Diesel locomotives.....units.....	729	729	734	744	747	759	763	701	700	710
Freight train cars.....do.....	43,423	42,065	41,737	41,838	43,426	44,308	40,681	41,239	40,712	42,346
Passenger train cars.....do.....	279	296	413	447	471	633	802	853	957	1,085
Capital expenditures.....thousands of dollars..	47,418	30,075	23,221	15,936	21,313	26,883	25,382	25,704	21,240	32,356
Long-term debt including current maturities.....do.....	295,769	225,795	224,173	225,896	235,497	242,364	217,853	220,734	212,380	219,976
Miles of road operated.....do.....	10,362	10,432	10,462	10,547	10,702	9,521	9,284	9,309	9,297	9,362

¹ Data for 1962 reflect effects of 30-day telegraphers' strike.

A security analyst sums it up this way: "The merger news is all talk and hope, the commuter business, when all is said and done, is still only 6 percent of C. & N.W.'s business. But the road's shippers and freight tonnage are where the real turnaround at C. & N.W. was accomplished. That's where the road's real strength has been a-building. Where else do you think Heineman got the money, leverage, and credit to go bidding for Rock Island? Or to buy a \$90 million chemical corporation when he decided on some contracyclical diversification for C. & N.W.?"

ACTION AT THE TOP

Contact with shipper requirements and competitive realities was quick once C. & N.W.'s new managers took over 10 years ago.

There was a lull for a few weeks after Heineman and Fitzpatrick moved into adjoining offices in C. & N.W.'s executive suite. Then the astonishing activity at the top began. It was to continue unabated for 10 years. It is still going strong and, if anything, is stepping up as the road continues to hack at internal inefficiency and improve its competitive position against trucks and barges operating in C. & N.W. land.

For weeks Heineman, with his quick, incisive intelligence, and Fitzpatrick, the practical, hard-boiled operating chief of IC whom Heineman had chosen to be C. & N.W.'s president, were everywhere on the railroad—evaluating men, plant, machines, operations, equipment, and organization.

A C. & N.W. trainmaster wrote to a journalist friend during that period: "The new chairman has an uncanny knack of asking questions that make you feel uneasy. Mr. Fitz doesn't say much, but he scribbles lots of notes." So began what has proved to be one of the most memorable collaborations in the history of railroad renovation.

MEETING PROBLEMS, HEAD ON

Little more than a month after they moved in at C. & N.W., Heineman and Fitzpatrick began making the tough decisions that were to become mileposts on C. & N.W.'s comeback journey. The quick, resourceful response to the road's problems illustrates both the magnitude of C. & N.W.'s trouble and the tough, analytical framework within which the road's new management energetically set out to restore some luster to what was once one of the bluest of blue-chip railroads in the United States.

On May 10, barely 6 weeks after the new management took over, C. & N.W. retired 116 steam engines and announced that all freight and passenger service was dieselized through more efficient scheduling of the road's 710 diesel locomotives. A few days later, reorganization of the road's operating department swept away the posts of four district superintendents and placed operations on a divisional rather than a departmental basis. (In later years, after C. & N.W. pared down to competitive weight by reducing employment from 27,000 employees in 1955 to about 14,500 in 1965, it was not often noticed that the road had made even sharper cuts in supervisory and middle-management ranks than it had among contract workers.)

In quick succession, decisions were made to expand track rehabilitation, bridge and roadbed programs; to install new accounting and reporting procedures; to reorganize the road's industrial development department and purchasing department; to shut down a third of giant Proviso yard (and release about 74 acres for eventual industrial development); to build a \$6 million freight-car shop at Clinton, Iowa (to replace 14 obsolete facilities) and to bring in highly qualified new men wherever there were not men suitable for promotion.

PLUGGING THE LEAKS

With passenger operations resulting in a \$26 million deficit in 1955, and with an \$11

million overall C. & N.W. deficit in mid-1956, Heineman recalls, "We put tourniquets on everything in sight." Associates say that during those first few tense months there was some concern lest there not be enough cash to meet payrolls in the 3d quarter.

On October 25, 1956, 7 months after C. & N.W.'s new management took the railroad in hand, the railroad made the first of a series of moves to plug the cash leaks caused by passenger trains. In an unprecedented move, it petitioned the Wisconsin Public Service Commission for permission to take off 21 trains, pleading the loss of \$2 million annually. In return it offered to buy new equipment to improve other trains. It was the first big move against passenger losses and was to be characteristic of dramatic C. & N.W. action that reduced that reduced passenger losses from \$23.4 million in 1956 to \$1.6 million in 1965.

HITTING A LOW

The road's working capital declined from a meager \$2.1 million at the end of 1955 to \$47,417 at the end of 1956. The \$5.5 million deficit at the end of 1956 forced the new management to suspend payment on C. & N.W.'s second mortgage bonds and on sinking fund requirements that were payable only if earned. Cash brought in by sale of scrap and real estate made it seem that C. & N.W. was staying alive by cannibalization of its own assets.

Hope stirred early in 1957. When the year began there were a lot of new faces on the C. & N.W. The average age of the road's executive officers was 48.6 years, compared with 55.3 years at the start of 1956. The railroad pushed industrial development of 6,200 acres near Peoria, Ill., announced a \$5 million program to automate crossings, discontinued its free LCL pickup and delivery service (which was losing \$1.5 million annually), bought a quarry to insure a supply of reliable ballast for its stepped-up roadway programs, bought the Litchfield & Madison for \$8 million, hired outside research experts to survey C. & N.W.'s real estate, began expanding TOFC service, created a motor carrier division to handle its expanding TOFC traffic and pushed programs in South Dakota and Minnesota for central agencies to replace the network of inefficient small stations that were draining C. & N.W.'s resources. The central agency setup was later applied to the road's extensive network of stations in Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and other States and, ultimately, it led to the telegraphers' strike of 1962.

GETTING TO THE CORNER

At the end of 1957, one could hardly say that C. & N.W. had turned the corner. But the road was getting into the corner's neighborhood. The \$5.5 million loss of 1956 was virtually eliminated, even though operating revenues dropped more than \$7 million. And, during that first full year of plugging up C. & N.W.'s cash leaks, the new management began to focus on the railroad's outside problem—the competition.

Said Heineman, 18 months after becoming chairman of C. & N.W.: "We have the unalterable conviction that the industry as a whole has been suffering from persistent erosion of its proportion of total intercity freight. While there are many contributing causes for the gains recorded by competing modes of transportation, not the least of these are the many railroad rates fixed at unrealistically high levels without regard to competition." The statement was a tipoff to C. & N.W.'s competitive strategy from then on.

SEEK OUTSIDE HELP

C. & N.W. began going to the outside for help when it needed answers to real estate, market, and passenger problems. The road has, over the years, spent thousands of dollars buying the services of professional researchers and consultants to get to the heart of problems in iron-ore movements, indus-

trial park location, commuter data of all kinds, diversification, and other problems where C. & N.W. felt it best to get advice from independent specialists.

Says a spokesman, "It's dangerous to have fixed notions in some areas when you're about to commit substantial effort and capital. We at C. & N.W. don't merchandise to please ourselves. That's why we so often call in outside research firms. They're more hardheaded and are less apt to get emotionally involved."

In 1958, the railroad cut 24 hours from its Chicago-west coast schedules (via its UP and SP connections). It dismantled its 21-acre freight house at Proviso, began systemwide training of sales personnel, and continued to attack internal inefficiency by pushing central agency systems. C. & N.W. secured approval from the Illinois Commerce Commission for a package of proposals on its commuter operations that were to result in a completely modernized service. The road also substantially boosted plant upgrading, equipment acquisitions, and car-repair programs.

Of equal significance in 1958, however, were reduced rates C. & N.W. installed on intrastate shipments of corn, oats, and soybeans in Minnesota—and its application for rate reductions on interstate shipments of corn, sorghums, and soybeans to Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Peoria markets. Multiple-car rates on pulpwood were announced. Freight train schedules were again tightened. C. & N.W. pressed tax claims against the United States. They were to prove important in the road's rehabilitation.

The railroad established a foreign trade department (in response to the St. Lawrence Seaway) and published a foreign trade handbook to inform C. & N.W. men and Midwestern shippers on the terminology and techniques of foreign trade for proper use of the seaway.

Orders were placed for an additional 36 doubledecker commuter cars (costing \$5.6 million). C. & N.W. announced a \$9 million rehabilitation program for 8,000 freight cars, the beginning of a series of massive programs and equipment acquisitions that were to result in reduction of C. & N.W.'s per diem deficit from \$6.5 million in 1955 to \$764,000 in 1964.

THE BETS LOOKED BAD

For a road that zigzagged above and below the breakeven point all the way into the early sixties (the \$1.8 million loss in 1962, the last deficit year, was attributed to the telegraphers' strike that year), C. & N.W. pushed some muscular capital spending programs from the very beginning. Programs stayed in the \$21 to \$26 million range (except for the strike year) until an upturn in revenues enabled C. & N.W. to spend \$30 million in 1964, more than \$50 million in 1965 and announce a record \$66 million in capital improvements for 1966.

In retrospect the capital spending moves before the upturn look inspired, but at the time they looked like bad bets to many in the industry, the financial community, and to the investing public. When Heineman and Fitzpatrick took over at C. & N.W., the road's common stock was selling at around \$27 and the preferred around \$37. By mid-1962, fading of confidence by the investing public could be seen in the abandonment of C. & N.W. by the investment trusts and other institutional buyers. C. & N.W. common was selling for \$8.75 a share.

C. & N.W. SHAPES UP

If misgivings existed in C. & N.W.'s stark, ultramodern executive offices, they did not reflect in either the direction or tempo of the road's internal or external action. C. & N.W. accelerated consolidation and elimination of facilities, getting rid of unnecessary tracks

around terminals, tearing up unneeded tracks in small towns, and passing tracks too short to hold modern era trains. Stations were closed by the hundreds, reducing maintenance substantially. Stations on lines where passenger service was eliminated were torn down and the land turned to other uses. Management appropriated money ("Even when it hurt," recalls one C. & N.W. officer) for mechanization of track work—\$11 million worth of machines—and stepped up programs wherever programs could quickly pay for themselves.

Chairman Heineman's conviction that "price moves merchandise" was the ruling axiom in C. & N.W.'s external moves as the fifties closed. C. & N.W. began making competition with incentive rates on butter, reduced rates on iron ore, livestock, lumber, coal, corn, and many other commodities. The moves held—and in some cases substantially increased—tonnages of C. & N.W.'s 10 largest revenue producing commodities. Pressure was constantly applied to reduction of passenger losses. Passenger train miles were reduced from 8.6 million in 1955 to 1.2 million by 1965.

INTERNAL OPTIMISM HIGH

Expansion of the road's commuter operations (as the C. & N.W. probed the possibilities for profit from this unlikely direction) came right after the start of 1960 when the road announced a \$29,554 profit on 1959 commuter operations. The road converted 45 locomotives for push-pull operation, and ordered 116 more bilevel coaches for such operations, giving it a fleet of 200 modern, double-deck coaches.

The road reduced grain rates on points west of the Missouri River, again expanded its industrial development department, scrapped whole fleets of obsolete suburban and passenger cars, reduced rates on iron ore to offset competition from foreign ores, agreed to buy 1,500-mile Minneapolis & St. Louis for \$20.9 million, handled the first bulk cargo (inedible tallow) through Navy Pier at Chicago and kept pressure on regulatory agencies for reduction of losing passenger trains.

In mid-1960, testifying before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, Heineman cited what must have been a substantial factor in C. & N.W.'s decline in the post-World War II years: In the 13 years from 1947 through 1959, cumulative losses from passenger train operations on C. & N.W. totaled \$287 million.

Later in 1960, Heineman, in a speech, deplored the lack of coordination in planning metropolitan transportation that forces commuter operations to compete with public funds. He offered to sell C. & N.W. suburban facilities rather than enter such competition. It was an offer he was to make even after the service became profitable. Just a few weeks ago, just after it was announced that C. & N.W.'s commuter trains produced a \$1.38 million net in 1965, Heineman told a Boston audience he would sell C. & N.W.'s commuter operation "lock, stock, and barrel" rather than compete with public money.

MORE IN EARLY SIXTIES

Computers, microwave, massive car-rebuilding programs, additions to the commuter fleet as passengers increased, reduced rates and a systematic upgrading of suburban stations and construction of a \$1-million TOFC terminal at Proviso were highlights of progress internally and externally at C. & N.W. up to mid-1963, when Heineman and C. & N.W. made headlines everywhere by deciding to fight moves by Union Pacific for control of Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific. C. & N.W. filed application for control of Rock Island, made a counter-offer to Rock Island's shareholders, and began what is proving to be the noisiest, most

complicated fight for control of a railroad that the industry has seen in many years.

The road cleared up interest arrearages on its bonds. It reinstated preferred dividends as Christmas of 1963 neared. Profits of \$203,000 for 1963's commuter operations were included in C. & N.W.'s net income of \$8.5 million from railroad operations that year.

MORE MERGER ACTION

As 1964 got underway, C. & N.W. announced more unit coal trains, sold lakefront land in Milwaukee and spent \$1.3 million dredging and constructing a facility at Escanaba, Mich., enabling deep-draft vessels to load there.

In mid-1964, Heineman's outspoken convictions about the need for consolidation of midwestern rail systems (based upon plans formulated by industry experts during the depression era) began to show up in C. & N.W. moves to consolidate with neighboring railroads. C. & N.W. and Chicago Great Western announced they were negotiating terms for merger. By September 1, both C. & N.W. and CGW boards approved the merger terms that had been worked out. Exactly 2 weeks later C. & N.W. and Milwaukee announced agreement on plans to merge. The C. & N.W.-CGW merger plan was recently approved by an ICC examiner (Railway Age Mar. 14, p. 7).

At year's end, C. & N.W.'s board declared a \$3 dividend on common stock to be made quarterly in 1965 on 1964 earnings (which came to \$23 million, including special credits from sale of real estate and refunds of State and Federal taxes amounting to \$15 million). The road posted a \$706,000 profit on its commuter operations at the end of 1964.

LAST YEAR, DIVERSIFICATION

C. & N.W.'s gains could be gaged early last year when it announced \$45 million in capital improvements (this was later increased to more than \$50 million). C. & N.W. bought abandoned Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee right-of-way in Kenosha and in Illinois, and continued its attack on competition and internal inefficiency. Last March, C. & N.W. and Milwaukee approved merger terms. Rates on corn in the Midwest to export markets via the St. Lawrence Seaway were cut.

On June 14, C. & N.W. announced it had agreed to buy the Velsicol Chemical Corp. for \$90 million, and was endeavoring (successfully, as it turned out) to buy 230,000 shares of Michigan Chemical Corp. (a Velsicol subsidiary) at \$33 per share so that it could file a consolidated return.

By late last year, C. & N.W. was back in the thick of the contest for control of Rock Island when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved its application for authority to make its existing exchange offer available to Rock Island shareholders who hold Union Pacific certificates of deposit. By late last year, too, C. & N.W. saw a substantial group of other midwestern railroads—including Milwaukee, Santa Fe, Missouri Pacific, Frisco, and other roads—also opposing Union Pacific control of Rock Island.

CHANGE IS RELATIVE

By 1966, C. & N.W. was shaping up—fast. The road's shares are now bought avidly by investors convinced that C. & N.W. and its remarkable chairman are on the way to bigger, better, and more profitable years ahead. The road's internal reworking is hardly over. As one veteran observer puts it, "A railroad takes a long time to go downhill, and it takes just as long to build it up again." But the road is handling its trains economically and building capability at an accelerating clip.

Early last January, C. & N.W.'s \$66 million capital improvement program, largest in the company's history, caused a stir. The program, noted Heineman, "will enable us to accelerate our program of tailoring our serv-

ices to the needs of our customers, and also help increase our overall operating efficiency, thereby enhancing our ability to maintain or reduce our present level of freight rates."

NOW, FASTER PROGRESS

Massive equipment purchases and equipment rebuilding programs from 1962 to the present have had a dramatic impact upon C. & N.W.'s once-ancient car fleet.

The road has placed orders for two RCA Spectra computers and for an IBM 360. Additional hotbox detectors are being added to C. & N.W.'s main lines. A \$6 million elevator capable of holding 5 million bushels of grain at Superior, Wis., will be completed this spring and leased to Continental Grain.

C. & N.W. is leasing, in a single order, more than 2,000 radio units and equipping all locomotive cabs, cabooses, and 170 way stations with two-way radio. As part of the program (aimed at developing greater efficiencies in operations over the road as well as in yards), head-end brakemen will also have portable walkie-talkies to use when they must be down from the cab.

WHAT'S AHEAD?

One commodity that is not in short supply at C. & N.W. these days is know-how. Larry S. Provo, C. & N.W.'s vice president, finance, notes that while progress is still needed in many areas of C. & N.W.'s operations, "We nonetheless have already made operations sensitive to management control and competition. That makes progress more possible. "If we did not have a thing to do in the next 10 years but consolidate with CGW and Milwaukee, that would be a great accomplishment in itself.

"We expect good results from our diversification. Chemicals have a much greater growth factor than railroads. A growth of 15 percent per year is not unusual in the chemical industry.

"Above all, more accurate decisions are ahead. It has been difficult to arrive at decisions because the industry is so large and complicated. We used to have 25 percent facts and 75 percent judgment enter into decisions. We hope to see that reversed one of these days. We've already come a long way. We're honing down the decision-making process here at C. & N.W."

NEED FREEDOM TO REACT

Heineman, a man who has done much to make the long-range approach more common, thinks prospects are bright for railroads generally and C. & N.W. particularly—if there is no business downturn, if concerted industry action unfreezes the rate apparatus.

"When business slows down, whether in the shirt business or any other business," he says, "there is a natural tendency to cut prices. Our trucker and barge friends are all able to make 'instant bargains' to haul bulk commodities. The railroads cannot unless they get legislative relief. If, when a downturn comes, railroads do suffer—as they may—it will be because of the rigidity of the price structure upon us but not upon our competition."

NOT ALL ROSES

Another C. & N.W. officer, noting that he feels C. & N.W. is still a marginal property, admits the past 10 years were not without errors of commission and omission. "Sure, we've made our share of bad moves—and some of them were beauts. No one can ever say definitely what value we missed by not making certain moves we could have made. We are painfully aware of the cost to C. & N.W. of moves we did make that we shouldn't have made. We made some costly mistakes, for example, with reduced fares on through passenger trains. We'd have done better to raise the fares.

"But, the important thing is that we react to facts—and we make a determined effort to

get the facts. We've done a lot. We've got a lot to do. You can't say we're passive about events here at C. & N.W. We're moving."

A TASTE OF SUCCESS

C. & N.W., having written a dazzling comeback story, begins 1966 with vitality, ideas and momentum. Its management is young and has had an exhilarating whiff of success. That's a magic mixture.

RAILROADS MUST AGREE ON WHAT IT IS THEY DO WELL

Ben W. Heineman has been described as a professional problem-solver. He had problems enough to solve at C. & N.W. the past 10 years. Many railroad men—and all C. & N.W. shareholders—think he handled them brilliantly.

He caused a stir among railroad men in the Midwest late last year when he made a problem-solver's stab at prescribing for maladies that afflict the industry. He called for railroads to "analyze clearly the problems and opportunity of the industry" and to have the "toughness of mind and basic courage to make clear to the public, to the Government, and to our coworkers what such analysis discloses to us."

Heineman said competition forces the industry to be price conscious: "Some railroads still believe rate reduction to meet truck competition is unwise because in reducing rates to meet 10 percent of competition they also reduce rates on 90 percent of a given commodity. The hope is that by doing nothing, the competition will go away. Competition doesn't go away. It increases."

The rail industry, says Heineman, has carried a great deal of "fat." Stripping it off "will permit us to absorb cost increases in labor and materials for longer than our competition is able to absorb them."

"We must agree on what we do well. Then we must cut the fat to permit us to do it at the lowest possible price. Then we will be able to rebuild our volume on a sound basis and again be adding employees—on a sound basis."

Heineman wants agreement on "the important objectives of the industry. * * * This great industry must come as closely as possible to having a unified voice and objective. If we are granted the wisdom to arrive at a consensus, a genuine consensus, as to what the course of this industry should be, and are granted in addition the courage not to be diverted from this, but to stay with it despite all conceivable challenges and obstacles—we'll be a great industry for a long time to come."

Asked what such an industry consensus ought to include, Heineman reiterated his previously expressed strong feeling that the industry ought to make clear to Government, public and to itself that trucks and barges do not carry passengers at a loss and neither can railroads if they are to perform basic functions to the country's benefit.

But, importantly, Heineman thinks the industry ought to achieve—

Agreement, generally, that price is the essence of competition, and that the industry must have the right to reduce rates.

Agreement on car ownership—as to who is obliged to own what kind of cars and in what quantity.

Agreement on a central system, perhaps a separate, jointly owned computer company, with basic responsibility (and authority) for equipment distribution.

Agreement on a unified approach to changing work rules in the industry.

Some kind of internal consensus on mergers "would be helpful. It would be difficult but not impossible to achieve."

Achieving agreement in these areas would, he thinks, enable railroads to solicit the support of shippers, labor, and the public and to present to Congress a program which all strongly support. "If the approach is force-

ful and united enough, shippers and the administration will support it."

Obstacles to such a consensus are—

The difficulty of getting railroad presidents together. "And even if you do get them together, you're not likely to get much done because the homework will not have been done."

The strong individualism prevailing among industry chiefs. "Responsible, as they should be, for their companies, they tend to look pretty closely at short-range difficulties rather than at long-range benefits."

Heineman sees strong staff work as a way around some of the obstacles. "Agreement might be possible if staff work was done well. There should be at least a year of preparation by first-rate people putting problems in focus. Meetings would be a waste of time without such preparation."

"Above all, there has to be desire and motivation before such a consensus can be achieved. Objectives on a national, unified basis are necessary to get the fat out of operations and to put a fine edge to our competitive capability."

"But before we can even make a beginning an industry group has to sit down and examine the feasibility—and value—of such a consensus."

EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will soon make its recommendations, and the Senate will consider the continuation of our foreign aid program. One of the most important elements of foreign aid, and perhaps the element of most lasting significance, is assistance to education.

On April 16, former Senator William Benton addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Science on the subject of "Education as an Instrument of American Foreign Policy." This address is another example of Senator Benton's consistently wise counsel, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By William Benton)

Back in the late summer of 1945—just before V-J Day—I was summoned to the service of the State Department; summoned in the fine old sense of commanded. I was to be an assistant secretary. This was in the days when there were only four assistant secretaries authorized by Congress and we had considerable standing in the city.

During my early weeks in the Department, I attended a lecture given by one of our distinguished Foreign Service career officers—later U.S. ambassador to several countries. He told us that the most significant act in international relations is the crossing of the border of one nation, without permission, by the troops of another nation.

More recently, another distinguished career officer—several times an ambassador—was asked by a Senate committee to describe the qualifications of an ideal American emissary. The single most important qualification, he replied, is the ambassador's professional judgment on when to threaten the use of force.

Here are two examples of a classical view of diplomacy. Today, however, the diplomat worried about threatening the use of force would be well advised if he headed for the

telephone; the hot line isn't there to be ignored. New conditions have forced a new diplomacy.

To what extent is the new diplomacy taking over? To what extent is it clearly recognized? These seem suitable questions to raise with this academy.

When I joined the postwar State Department, I was to be in charge of the new diplomacy. This included the war-spawned activities of the OIAA, the OWI, the OSS, and other vibrant overseas agencies. It encompassed all of the Department's informational activities, domestic as well as international, including what became the Voice of America. I was also in charge of American participation in UNESCO and, indeed, of all the Department's so-called cultural activities, including the exchange of professors and students. Further—believe it or not—I was responsible for nothing less than the reeducation of Germany and Japan. Although I did not know it on the day of my command, I and my new diplomacy were not welcomed by the classical practitioners, those of whom it has sometimes been said, they are honest men sent abroad to lie for their country.

An early impulse was to call upon my old friend from the Midway, Harold Lasswell. As most of you know, Harold is a kind of one-man academy of political and social science. He knows practically everything about everything. Beardsley Ruml once called him the best educated man in America, and by this Beardsley meant the best educated man he had ever educated in his days dispensing largesse for the general education board. At my request and for the special benefit of Congress, Dr. Lasswell abandoned his famous polysyllables and condensed the factors involved in international relations into four five-letter words. The first word was "force"—the use or the threat of armed might. The second was "deals"—meaning diplomatic arrangements. The third was "goods"—meaning economic dispositions. The fourth was the relatively new diplomacy—"words"—the open covenants openly arrived at—meaning, more precisely, propaganda, or, to use less propagandistic words, meaning information and culture in all their forms. That fourth was the great newly recognized field—my special area—important everywhere in the world but made especially important in some areas by the rise of educated electorates. Dr. Lasswell was its prophet; he was and is to the best of my knowledge the leading theoretician of international propaganda. He gently reminded me that one of the principal functions of "words" in international relations was to "economize on the use of force." Force remained the fundamental.

The title assigned me for my speech today, "Education as an Instrument of Foreign Policy," suggests that a fifth five-letter word should now be added to Harold Lasswell's quartet. The new word is "teach."

This in no way minimizes force, deals, and goods as instruments to be manipulated in the pursuit of foreign goals. Perhaps it only emphasizes that words—particularly those words and images that can fairly be called educational—will play proportionately a greater role. However, I am less sanguine of their impact than I was 20 years ago. I am less hopeful of quick progress through the new diplomacy.

Many of us then were confident, and somewhat in a hurry to prove it, that Understanding with a capital "U" could prove an answer to many of mankind's ills. We persuaded ourselves to the belief that as there were fewer misunderstandings in the world there would be fewer tensions to be relaxed and fewer relations to be improved. This seemed a recognizable goal within a realizable future.

I startled the State Department by arguing that the United States should welcome at least 50,000 foreign students a year.

There were 10,000 here then, in 1946. I wrote an article in the Ladies' Home Journal entitled "Our Best Weapon—Exchange Students." One sentence in that article was based on my observations in a prewar visit to Shanghai. It read, "It is said that 40 percent of the leading civil servants in China have studied at American universities." Three years later the Communists had seized China's mainland. Today there are 90,000 foreign students here in the United States. It's wonderful; and I still argue that exchange students are a potent weapon. Should I still argue they are our best?

Has UNESCO, which has sought Understanding with a capital "U," actually contributed to peace, or even understanding? The UNESCO General Conference in November of 1964 set up a special round table to meet at the next Conference in November of this year to discuss how UNESCO has and can contribute to peace. This is in tribute to UNESCO's charter and in commemoration of its 20th anniversary.

In the 20 years UNESCO's program has undergone a swing of roughly 180° in orientation. We who pioneered UNESCO at the London Conference in 1945, where we wrote the charter, were anxious first to help repair war-devastated schools, universities, and libraries. (To that end I personally gave \$75,000 of the 1945 printing of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.) Our longer range perspective was focused on the more developed countries. Like the old Institute of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, UNESCO proposed to concentrate largely on the advanced countries. It would construct "the defenses of peace in the minds of men" where, traditionally, wars began. The big wars didn't begin in the underdeveloped countries.

Not foreseen by us in London was the trend that today puts more than 90 percent the UNESCO's program into helping the relatively underdeveloped countries. Can our projected UNESCO round table on peace demonstrate that this encourages peace? I hope so. But the viewpoint must be very long range. Surely it will be easy to demonstrate that the UNESCO program embraces education as an instrument of foreign policy. Yes, the word "teach" is now paramount in UNESCO. But the "defenses of peace"—those to be constructed remain on the horizon. Education holds no quick promise of peace or even of understanding.

Still, the promise is there—even if it does not warrant an immediate or massive educational crusade. One formidable obstacle to any such crusade, very easy to understand, confronts us in the literacy figures. Seven hundred million adults—4 out of every 10 of the world's population—can neither read nor write. The number is increasing. Does this then warrant a vast worldwide campaign? Unfortunately, we are not yet ready. We don't know how to make it stick. When we do, I shall favor it. Promising starts have been made. UNESCO is sponsoring a spatter of experiments. What we learn from them we hope to expand, ultimately on a world basis. The so-called new techniques are being applied in some areas. But where choices must now be made at the adult level—and they must—I feel that first priority must go to the education of people who are being trained for jobs. Thus, it is now better to take the illiterate factory worker and teach him to read and write so that he may become a foreman than it is to stretch our present goals to the masses of illiterate peasants. Two years ago Minister of Education Torres Bodet told me that 50 percent of all Mexican children drop out of school after the first grade. But even if they didn't in many communities there are no books. Torres Bodet's goal was 50 books for every community schoolhouse. In Brazil, in most of the 50,000 primary schools,

largely taught by teachers with only an elementary school education, there are few if any books. These two illustrations from these two relatively advanced countries show the complexity of the literacy problem.

How then shall the United States pursue the promise? Last autumn President Johnson signaled the wave of the future for U.S. policy, and doubtless stimulated the suggested title of my speech today, in his speech at the Smithsonian Institution. This former Texas schoolteacher had already earned himself a secure place in the history of American education by sponsoring the great congressional acts of 1965 which will raise to \$10 billion a year the total Federal money going into domestic education. In the Smithsonian speech he preempted center stage in world education. The President said:

"The men who founded our country knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

"We know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared."

President Johnson concluded his speech with his outline of a program of five points.

Rene Maheu, Director General of UNESCO even before these points had been cabled to me as the U.S. member of UNESCO's Executive Board which was then meeting in Paris, read them point-by-point to the Board as a statement of historic importance. Here is the President's projected five-point U.S. policy:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, and works of science and imagination.

Fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problem of mankind.

Shortly after his Smithsonian speech, President Johnson hammered home his theme in a speech to the bankers. He startled them by coolly suggesting that education is more important than money. Rene Maheu also read this to the UNESCO Board.

The President then set up his task force to prepare the recommendations for Congress. Was its Chairman the head of the Office of Education? Not at all. Was he the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare? No. He was the Secretary of State.

In February, the President implemented the findings of the task force by calling upon the Congress to establish a Center for Educational Cooperation. Is this a center for encouraging cooperation among the 50 States as Dr. Conant has recommended? No, it is not, even though such a center is manifestly needed. The President informed the Congress, "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes * * * it must be at the heart of our international relations." The eyes of the Center are thus to be fixed in large measure outside our own borders.

(The President's new initiatives in international education also anticipate a "Council on International Education"; the creation of a corps of education officers in the U.S. Foreign Service; further stimulation of exchanges with students and teachers of other lands; direct support of countries struggling to improve their educational standards, in-

cluding the development of new techniques for basic education and assistance in the teaching of English; and finally, building new bridges of international understanding through conferences and through the increased flow of books and audiovisual materials.)

The President's February message—which will shortly come before Congress for action, and will deserve your support—further suggested the establishment of what he called "binational educational foundations." When the President greeted Madam Gandhi, he proposed creation of the first such Foundation, an Indian-American Foundation, "to promote progress in all fields of learning in India." This was no airy gesture. The President proposes to put behind the new foundation \$300 million in blocked rupees accruing from sales of food to India under Public Law 480.

We Americans are by no means alone in sensing these new directions. For example, every year the Soviet Union produces 100 million books in English, French, German, and Spanish—with major emphasis on English.

(There are 41,000 teachers of English in the Soviet Union and the Russians seem reasonably resigned to the fact that English and not Russian has become the world language of science, and that English, not Russian, is becoming the auxiliary language of nation after nation. If anyone wonders why the Britannica bought the Merriam-Webster dictionary, I can assure you it was not merely to help our subscribers understand the polysyllabic articles you and Lasswell write for the Britannica—and our salesmen do indeed expect to sell a dictionary with every set. But it was also to promote English throughout the world—and of course to profit thereby.)

These 100 million Soviet books are not limited to Marxist-Leninist propaganda. Many are texts by Soviet authors in physics, chemistry, geology, biology, medicine and engineering. These are made available to students at low cost—at most nominal cost compared with the prices of American texts in the same fields. India and Brazil are notable areas for distribution of such English-language texts. Recently I heard a report about a startling example of Soviet enterprise. An American professor, appointed by an Egyptian university to teach a course in American civilization, found that the books he assigned his classes weren't available in Cairo in American editions. But, according to the report, Soviet manufactured English-language books about America were plentiful.

Such a direct attack is not the only way the Soviet Union applies this aspect of the new diplomacy to foreign policy. Ten years ago I wrote an article for the New York Times magazine entitled "The Cold War of the Classrooms." This article was based on the first of my five trips to the Soviet Union. Last month I published a book titled "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," based on the latest of these trips. Ten years ago and again today I have described the gauntlet the Soviets have flung at us in education. This, in my view, may prove to be their great challenge. It has been made by them most openly—and avowedly—and I would add most honestly—as a proposed test of the worth of our two social systems. "Follow our educational model," the Soviets cry to the underdeveloped nations, "and you, too, can pull yourselves up by your bootstraps."

In my judgment the Soviets have one undeniable advantage over us in education: they appear to have greater faith in it than we do, and they work harder at it. Their conception of the aim of education is of course wholly different: they aim at service to the state, while we hope to aim at the development of the individual to his highest potential powers. They have not yet achieved our degree of universality, particularly at the secondary school level. But

the measure of their concentration—both in the party and government and by the individual—is breathtaking. The vocabulary standard for a Russian fourth-grade youngster is twice that of an American. Pupils entering 10th grade, having had 9 years of mathematics, tackle calculus while ours are still floundering with solid geometry or trigonometry. The Soviet budget for education—which equals its budget for defense—represents 15 percent of gross national product, compared with our 5 percent.

Let me give you an example of the grim Soviet devotion to education. Last September the periodical *Sovetskaya Kultura* complained that only 7 percent of the time on Soviet TV is devoted to entertainment. The author, one Victor Slavkin, says, "Of course I don't count such things as animated cartoons in a program on health education as entertainment." He concludes with a protest, "The viewer should not be considered a patient who wishes some medicine, nor a schoolboy to be seated at a desk."

Russia's present plans for television call for setting aside one entire network for education, extending from Leningrad to Vladivostok. This is not intended as a means of so-called "enriching" of primary and secondary school courses—which, in effect, is what most of our daytime ETV programs turn out to be. The new Soviet ETV network is to concentrate on advanced education in evening or prime hours. It will be integrated with correspondence techniques and the students will get periodic time off from their jobs to attend the universities. It will be devoted to training in medicine, engineering, and other advanced disciplines. The head of Soviet TV explained to me, "We have plenty of teachers and we thus don't need TV's help in the 10-year schools. We need more engineers even though we are now graduating three times as many as you are. Further, we shall command the help and leadership of our top scholars and academicians in developing our TV courses. We shall give diplomas with the same standing as those of our universities and research institutions."

Does such Soviet dedication to education have any implications for our foreign policy? What do you think? Doesn't this question apply particularly to the potentialities of the new techniques of education? Here at home as well as in President Johnson's proposed program outside our borders, I see high hope in the use of radio and television, in programed self-instruction, in films and filmstrips, and language laboratories. Everyone admits that there is no perfect substitute for a good teacher. But where are there enough good teachers? Our country has pioneered in the development of the new techniques, and Prof. Wilbur Schramm of Stanford, is now pioneering through UNESCO in the study of their application in the developing countries. But the application both at home and abroad promises to be painfully slow.

Recently my friend Prime Minister Harold Wilson sent Lord Goodman to me armed with the recent British white paper which proposes a TV channel dedicated to a new "University of the Air." The projected courses are to rival in quality those at the British universities. Isn't it a certainty that such courses will be exported? Should they not even be exported to the United States? Indeed, perhaps the greatest hope for us in the United States—in our efforts to use the great new medium of TV for "the public interest, convenience, and necessity"—and most notably for education—perhaps our greatest hope lies in the lessons to be jammed down our throats from the use of TV by the British, the Italians, and the Japanese who are now in the forefront—yes, and also the Russians. Can't an assembly of scholars like this one dare to hope that our American people won't tolerate great progress in the use of

TV for education abroad in contrast to continued neglect and apathy at home?

Prof. C. E. Beeby, for 20 years Minister of Education in New Zealand, later Assistant Deputy Director of UNESCO, still later Chairman of UNESCO's Executive Board, and now at Harvard, has written:

"In the period between the two wars we had discovered that education could be a force in social change, but except in totalitarian countries, the change of which we spoke was a staid and stately process that bore little resemblance to the kaleidoscopic events in Africa and Asia over the past decade."

The evolving countries have told us the "staid and stately" pace in education just won't do in these times even if we are prepared to tolerate it at home. James Reston recently wrote:

"Wherever (Washington officials) look in the developing world they find much the same situation—the gap widening between the rich industrial nations of the northern climes and the poor industrial nations of the southern; vast corrective programs dealing with the effects of poverty and illiteracy, but scarcely touching the causes, and everywhere in these poor lands human fertility outrunning human ingenuity."

India's current 5-year plan uses the following words:

"Education is the most important single factor in achieving rapid economic development and technological progress and in creating a social order founded on the values of freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity."

President Johnson has used the phrase "the gospel of development."

Even those nations today which turn their backs on the gospel are eager for development. Education is the key. It is also the only solid basis, as India insists, for freedom, social justice, and equal opportunity. Who then in this scientific group can deny that it thus must be a central concern in the development of our foreign policy?

Unhappily, almost by definition the gospel of development—the so-called revolution of rising expectations—will be accompanied by conflict and dissension. But there will be little hope of resolving the conflicts, and of achieving peace in our century, unless the world makes heroic efforts in education—sustained, imaginative, and ever-greater efforts.

Thus education is destined to become a characteristic form of America's involvement in world affairs. I agree this is an optimistic view of the future. I give it to you political scientists whose work is often permeated by pessimism under the guise of realism. I leave you as you adjourn your important conference with this optimistic view. Can we call my view other than optimistic since education is indeed an end in itself? It is the very essence of the American dream. It is now as well a means to many ends. Some of these will increasingly guide the conduct of our foreign policy. For this, I am thankful.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, if one's greatness is measured by his character and integrity and by the courage of his convictions, then truly Pat McNamara was a great man.

A man of very humble beginnings, he began his life working with his hands and, although he later held one of the highest offices of this Nation, he never forgot his early associations with men and women of labor. He never succumbed to the temptations of power and the vanity of prestige. He was concerned with the plight of the elderly, the ill, the uneducated, and the youth of our

Nation. He was truly a friend of the forgotten underdog.

If one's greatness is measured by the warmth of his heart and the milk of human kindness which flows through his veins, then truly Pat McNamara was a great man. Although he was a man of huge physical proportions, he responded to the cries of a little infant and was concerned with the plight of helpless animals. He was truly a compassionate person.

Pat McNamara was truly one of the finest men I have met along life's pathway. In his passing, our Nation has suffered a great loss, but because of his presence in this world, our Nation today is a greater and much better place. Our Nation will miss him and I will miss him.

INFLATIONARY TRENDS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, indicative of the increasing concern throughout our Nation over inflationary trends are the comments expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Friday, April 22, edition of the *Pratt, Kans., Tribune*.

This thoughtful piece, entitled "From All Points of the Compass," emphasizes the paradoxical effect on our economy of vast Federal defense and welfare programs. I would commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM ALL POINTS OF THE COMPASS

Inflation news is coming in from all the points of the compass nowadays.

For instance, says a Herald Tribune News Service dispatch, wholesale prices took a big jump in February, according to the Department of Labor. It was the biggest for any February in all of 16 years. And it "lifted the closely watched price inflation barometer 4.1 percent above its year-ago level."

Government spokesmen, the report goes on, express the hope that the wholesale price index may soon stop its upward surge. Just about everyone will concur in that. But, as past history has proven, this may turn out to be whistling in the dark, and the forces which are now shouldering prices and costs upward may prove irresistible.

The ordinary citizen, worriedly watching further degradation of the dollar can only hope for the best. Each of those dollars buys a little less each month. And there can be small doubt that this will continue so long as we attempt to fight a major war, declared or undeclared, and with it carry on welfare programs of unprecedented scope and cost. It cannot be too often repeated that in this way we create new classes of poor at a time when a major governmental purpose is to combat and eliminate poverty.

A SOUND VIEW

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the "sound view of Vietnam," held by Secretary Freeman has been lauded by the Denver Post.

The Post quotes Freeman as saying that "agriculture is the key to lasting victory in Vietnam," and the paper adds:

More and more, this is being accepted as truth. Military effort, by itself, is not enough. Only a sweeping modernization of the Vietnamese economy—particularly in the

rural areas—will achieve the lasting victory we seek.

Because we are concerned about the "second front," and because this editorial on the subject is most informative, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEMAN HAS SOUND VIEW OF VIETNAM

Orville Freeman's view of the problem in South Vietnam differs little from that held by other members of President Johnson's Cabinet. Nevertheless, having recently toured rural areas of South Vietnam as an expert observer, the Agriculture Secretary gives an impression of persuasive credibility.

He believes, in the words he used in addressing the National Farmers Union convention in Denver, that "agriculture is the key to lasting victory in Vietnam."

More and more, this is being accepted as truth. Military effort, by itself, is not enough. Young peasant volunteers must be organized in a concerted program aimed at opening up what Freeman calls a "second front" in the long Vietnamese war.

The military fight for territory has made some progress. But only a sweeping modernization of the Vietnamese economy—particularly in the rural areas—will achieve the lasting victory we seek.

President Johnson expressed this view in the Declaration of Honolulu, which followed his conference in Hawaii with leaders of the South Vietnamese Government. Johnson's Agriculture Secretary gave the Declaration full support in his Denver speech last week.

Rural uplift is not new. But the effort needs to be so much greater than we have hitherto been willing to hazard that it amounts—at the very least—to a major shift of emphasis in the Asian war.

The reason for the difficulty is that on-going programs are hard to maintain in the face of hit-and-run terrorism by the Vietcong. Secretary Freeman said the 1,500 village chiefs killed in South Vietnam during the last few years are equivalent "in the United States to assassinating 60,000 American mayors and county commissioners."

Obviously it is difficult to bring progress. Few villagers want to volunteer for the firing squad.

Nevertheless, this is what must happen. Progress and modernization must be made so attractive that the South Vietnamese people are willing to take the gamble because they are convinced the Vietcong represent only bloodshed and repression.

The \$275 million aid package now before Congress, plus expanded aid to be sought in the next fiscal year, is the first installment in the sweeping program aimed at escalating rural progress in the war-torn country.

We believe, as does Secretary Freeman, that this will be money well spent. Military effort alone will not get the job done; a combined effort has a good chance of bringing peace to southeast Asia.

Perhaps the program envisioned by Secretary Freeman—improved agricultural technology, education, land reform and an upgrading of rural life generally—will someday produce a pattern of peaceful development which can spread from South Vietnam to other underdeveloped nations. That would be a marvelous bonus, indeed, because the killer in other countries—the specter of famine—poses a threat which is far more deadly in its implications than the Vietcong.

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR MICRONESIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a deep sense of personal interest and sat-

isfaction that I note that the Department of the Interior and the Peace Corps have announced plans to recruit, train, and assign as many as 750 Peace Corps volunteers to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia.

On March 21 of this year—more than a month and a half ago—I urged the Secretary of the Interior to seek the services of Peace Corps volunteers for Micronesia which the Interior Department administers. In my letter to Secretary Udall, I stated that it was "not only proper but a matter of priority that the Micronesians receive urgent assistance from the Peace Corps." Specifically I referred to the need for improving education, medical and health services, economic development, and other activities.

Secretary Udall responded to me at that time by saying that "your proposal is indeed intriguing and we shall want to study it very carefully."

It was my concern over the failure of the Interior Department to utilize Peace Corps volunteers long before now which prompted me to write to Secretary Udall. For it has been evident for some time that the Interior Department has not come to grips with the many problems of this far flung and underdeveloped area of the western Pacific.

I am very pleased, therefore, that the Interior Department now agrees with my proposal to use Peace Corps volunteers in the Trust Territory. I am doubly happy that both the Interior Department and the Peace Corps are moving with unusual swiftness to carry out my proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks the texts of my letter of March 21 to Secretary Udall and his acknowledgment to me; a fact sheet issued by the Peace Corps titled, "Peace Corps and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia;" and a news article from the Washington Post of May 7, 1966, titled, "Pacific Islands Showplace Is Peace Corps Aim."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1).

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is a matter of deep pride to the people of Hawaii that the training of the Peace Corps volunteers for Micronesia will take place in Hawaii. Hundreds of Peace Corps volunteers have been trained for service in various Asian countries at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii and at the Peace Corps camp in Waipo Valley operated by the university, both located on the big island of Hawaii. The experience already gained by the Peace Corps staffs in Hawaii will be of great value in training the prospective volunteers for the trust territory.

The Peace Corps volunteers will give the Micronesians the kind of practical assistance they need and have asked for—in education, community development, public health and public works. The volunteers will thereby help the trust territory people build the social, economic and political basis for self-government.

As the Micronesians progress, they will be better able to decide the type of polit-

ical status they wish for themselves. Looking toward this eventuality, I introduced in the Senate, on August 18, 1965, a resolution which would open the way for the trust territory to be included in the State of Hawaii if the people of Hawaii and the trust territory are in favor of such inclusion.

The assignment of Peace Corps volunteers to the trust territory will go a long way toward preparing the Micronesians to decide their future status. I am, therefore, very pleased and enthusiastic over this development.

EXHIBIT 1

MARCH 21, 1966.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In line with my general concern for the status of the people of Micronesia, I am writing to recommend strongly the use of Peace Corps volunteers in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

There is a clear and current need in the Trust Territory for the type of services which the Peace Corps can render. As High Commissioner M. W. Goding said in addressing the opening session of the first congress of Micronesia on July 12, 1965, at Saipan: "There is a tremendous job that remains to be done. Many of the problems we face might be described as being typical of any growing but undeveloped economy. One of the most challenging problems and one that will require bold and imaginative approach lies in improving living conditions, in supplying adequate medical services and educational opportunities for people in the more remote and thinly populated islands of the Territory."

Commissioner Goding thus noted that while some progress has been made, a great deal of work lies ahead in improving education, medical and health services, economic development, and other fields. Volunteers of the Peace Corps have been notably successful in helping people help themselves in these activities in underdeveloped areas elsewhere. They can render invaluable services to Micronesians if assigned there.

Since the well-being of the Trust Territory people is a responsibility of the United States, and more particularly of your Department, it would seem to me not only proper but also a matter of priority that the Micronesians receive urgent assistance from the Peace Corps.

If there are legal, technical, or other reasons why Peace Corps volunteers cannot be assigned to the Trust Territory, I wish to be fully advised on this matter and would appreciate information as to what steps can be taken to overcome such obstacles.

May I hear from you at your earliest convenience.

With warm personal regards and aloha, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HIRAM L. FONG.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

HON. HIRAM L. FONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FONG: I am acknowledging your letter of March 21, in which you propose the use of Peace Corps volunteers to assist the Micronesians people.

Your proposal is indeed intriguing and we shall want to study it very carefully. We shall be writing you further on this subject at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

PEACE CORPS AND THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (MICRONESIA)

WHAT IS IT?

The trust territory consists of 2,141 islands spread over 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific. Taken from Japan in World War II, the islands were placed under a United Nations trusteeship in 1947. Their administration was assigned by mandate to the United States, which in a string of bloody battles, had driven the Japanese out of them.

WHAT IS MICRONESIA?

This is the name given to those Pacific island occupied by the Micronesian peoples, seafaring first cousins to the Malays. Greater Micronesia includes the Gilbert Islands, which are under British administration. Otherwise, Micronesia and the trust territory are the same—embracing the Marianas, Marshall, and Caroline Archipelagos. Guam, the largest of the Marianas, is not included in the trust territory since it became an American possession in 1898, when it was ceded to the United States by Spain.

WHO ARE THE MICRONESIANS?

They include most of the 88,000 inhabitants of the 97 populated islands of the trust territory. (Two of these islands, Nukuoro and Kapingamarangi, are homes for another people, the Polynesians.)

They speak nine separate Micronesian languages with dialectal variations. They came to Micronesia in prehistoric times, probably sailing their great oceangoing outrigger canoes from lands lying to the east. They were already settled in the Marianas when Ferdinand Magellan discovered them for the West in 1521.

WHERE IS MICRONESIA?

Milli, the westernmost of the Marshalls, is less than 100 miles east of the international date line. More than 3,000 miles farther east, Tobi in the western Carolines lies off the northern tip of New Guinea. Almost 2,000 miles northwest of Tobi, the remote and uninhabited Farallon de Pajaros juts its rocky peak out of the ocean less than 700 miles from Japan.

In all the huge expanse of water included in Micronesia (larger than the land area of the United States), only 687 square miles are above sea level.

WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL ISLANDS?

Saipan and Tinian in the Marianas became the sites of B-29 bases in World War II from which Japan was regularly bombed. The *Enola Gay* took off from Tinian on the fateful day when it dropped to atom bomb on Hiroshima. Bikini, in the Marshalls, was the site of America's first H-bomb explosion.

In preparation for World War II, the Japanese constructed major fortifications on Yap and Truk in the Carolines. The American assault against the Japanese brought the names of other islands to the attention of the world—Eniwetok, Kwajalein, Ulithi, the Palaus.

WHY IS THE PEACE CORPS GOING TO THE TRUST TERRITORY?

The Micronesians asked for Peace Corps volunteers—for teachers, engineers, surveyors, health experts, agricultural extensionists, draftsmen and persons who know how to organize and run cooperatives. And that is what the Peace Corps plans to send.

WHEN WILL VOLUNTEERS GO TO MICRONESIA?

Two waves of volunteers are now planned. The first, to arrive by October 1966, will begin programs in elementary education and community development, public health, and public works. The second, to begin in January 1967, will concentrate on secondary education, cooperative and credit union development, agriculture, public administration, communications and transportation. These two waves will involve as many as 750 volunteers. Others will follow later.

WHERE WILL THEY TRAIN?

The prospective volunteers will take their training at the Hilo campus of the University of Hawaii and at the Peace Corps camp in Waipio Valley operated by the university. Their training conditions will simulate as far as possible their later working conditions.

WILL THE PEACE CORPS PLAY A SPECIAL ROLE IN THE TRUST TERRITORY?

In his May 5, 1966, letter to Peace Corps Director Jack Vaughn, President Johnson said: "I will be asking the Congress to approve the Department of the Interior's omnibus legislation which seeks to improve the capital budget of the territory and to raise the level of the Interior Department's continuing effort in the territory. However, I see the Peace Corps role as a very special kind of effort being separate and apart from the daily tasks of civil administration."

This "special kind of effort" will lie at the heart of a fresh attempt to fulfill America's responsibilities in the trust territory. It will seek to improve the conditions of life for the people of Micronesia.

Finally, it will help build the material and spiritual circumstances in which the people of the trust territory can intelligently and successfully—and in the not-too-distant future—choose their own form of government.

[From the Washington Post]

PACIFIC ISLANDS SHOWPLACE IS PEACE CORPS AIM

(By Bryce Nelson)

Several hundred Peace Corps volunteers will be sent to the U.S.-administered Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in an effort to make them "a showplace for the world," the administration announced yesterday.

Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, declared that the United States already had done much for the trust territory but that "We have to do better than we have done, very frankly."

U.S. administration of the 90,000 people, who live in the 2,141 Micronesian islands scattered across 3 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean, has been under increasing criticism in recent years, both domestically and at the United Nations. The United States was given trusteeship over the area in 1947 by the U.N. after defeating the island's former trustees, the Japanese, in World War II.

COMPLAINTS FILED

Last spring, health officials in the islands sent a petition of grievances to the U.N. Trusteeship Council.

The Council responded by asking the World Health Organization to send an investigating mission to the area last fall. The report, which listed shortages in health facilities and personnel in Micronesia, will probably be discussed by the Trusteeship Council in late June.

Goldberg conceded yesterday that there had been some criticism at the United Nations and added, "We as Americans have to have always our tradition of decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and we are manifesting that respect by the attention we are paying to the subject."

Goldberg said yesterday that the commitment of Peace Corps volunteers to Micronesia symbolized the U.S. "determination to discharge our full responsibility as trustees."

In the 19 years of the U.S. trusteeship, there has never been an election to determine the wishes of the Micronesians as to the status of their islands. In a letter sent to Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn and dated May 5, President Johnson declared, "Ultimately the people of Micronesia must decide what their future status will be."

NO ELECTION TIMETABLE

Goldberg said yesterday that there had been no timetable set for elections but that

the administration hoped to "achieve this as rapidly as possible."

The Peace Corps action was announced at a three-man press conference at the State Department by Goldberg, Vaughn, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, whose Department is charged with administering the territories.

To supplement the Peace Corps effort, Udall announced that his Department was sending legislation to Congress to substantially increase the amount of money the Interior Department spends to aid the trust territory. Udall pointed out that the current annual budget was \$17 million and that the annual expenditure was only about \$7 million until 2 years ago. Udall said that his Department currently had 300 employees in the trust territory.

Vaughn said the number of volunteers to be sent to Micronesia was as yet undetermined but that he thought that several hundred would be sent in October. The second group of volunteers will be sent next January. Peace Corps officials indicated that the total number would probably be about 700.

REENLISTMENT ALLOWED

To help gain volunteers for Micronesia, the Peace Corps will allow current volunteers to reenlist to work in a different project for the first time. Volunteers have sometimes been allowed to reenlist to work in the country to which they were originally assigned, but they have never been allowed to change countries prior to this time.

The project also will mark the first assignment of Peace Corps volunteers to territory administered by the United States.

The Peace Corps begins a crash recruiting program Monday at approximately 62 colleges in order to obtain volunteers before the students begin their final examinations and leave for their summer vacations.

The Peace Corps has already prepared its recruiting pamphlet for the Micronesian project. It is entitled "The Peace Corps Goes to Paradise" and begins: "Tropical islands. Enchanted evenings. Swaying palms and sun-kissed maidens."

But the brochure also is quick to point out the "problems in Paradise": "Understaffed schools. Bad roads. Insufficient medical facilities. Inadequate water and sanitary facilities. An island territory that has to import seafood."

THE GROWING SHORTAGE OF TRAINED PERSONNEL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the most serious problems confronting our country in the field of health is the growing shortage of trained personnel. The Congress has already taken steps to meet this need by passing legislation such as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Nurse Training Act, and the Vocational Education Act. Presently before the Congress is the Health Manpower Act designed to provide more medical technologists, biomedical engineers, dental hygienists, and other college-trained specialists.

Although these Federal programs are making a valuable contribution, there is a great need for complementary local action. I am, therefore, particularly pleased to note an outstanding example of such initiative in my own State directed at a solution to the critical shortage of trained nurses. Knowledge of this local effort came to me in the form of an editorial in the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society, condensed and reprinted in the Arkansas Gazette.

The editorial, written by Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr., describes a plan originally conceived by Mrs. Mildred Armour, head of the Arkansas Baptist School of Nursing, and later adapted in the form of a proposal of the Pulaski County Medical Society.

Because this article shows the productive imagination which can be generated when local groups address themselves to the responsibilities and needs of their communities and professions, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTOR DEFINES AND EXPLAINS NURSE SHORTAGE, SUGGESTS POSSIBLE SOLUTION

(NOTE.—Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr., of Little Rock wrote the accompanying editorial in the Journal of the Arkansas Medical Society. It has been edited to make it somewhat shorter. In Little Rock, the scarcity of nurses is such that St. Vincent Infirmary has had to close a 27-bed ward, an unprecedented action.)

(By Dr. Alfred Kahn, Jr.)

Despite the fact that there have been signs for a long time that hospitals were short of personnel to carry out patient care, the full impact has not reached the public and the physicians in this area until the crisis was on us. This is often the case in other walks of life and, in fact, the critical nature of the situation often is of value in that it prompts strenuous and concerted activity to remedy the situation.

The so-called nursing shortage probably should be redefined. What is meant by this is the lack of trained personnel to do bedside care of the patient. The reasons for this fall into two categories: The acute problem and the long-range problem.

Unfortunately, most of the discussions about the lack of bedside personnel have had to do with the acute shortage. This so-called acute shortage simply means that there are barely enough registered nurses in this area to keep the hospitals in what one might term "a state of compensation."

Basically, the cause is the critical lack of nurses. However, superimposed on this are some acute problems, which have caused the nurses to leave the hospitals.

SALARY FOREMOST OF ALL PROBLEMS

Foremost among these problems is that of salary. After 3 years of nursing training, many nurses can get more money by going to a Veterans' Administration hospital or into a physician's office than they can obtain by working in a hospital. In a world of free economy it has always been the policy that the worker has a right to try and obtain the best salary which he can get. And yet \$350 per month, after 3 years of training, is better than many young college women get with a degree and after 4 years of training. This is no attempt to say that \$350 is the right amount to start nurses at.

One of the major complaints of nurses is that they would like to have weekends off; many nurses do not want to work night or split shifts; all of these things are reasonable but they add to the problem of staffing the hospital. There are other irritating seemingly minor problems, which have entered into the overall acute picture and turned nurses away from the hospital. These include frequent change of assignments, association with less trained personnel in the care of the patients, etc. In other words, the short-range problem is one of "making do" with barely enough nurses.

SEMANTICS ADDS TO THE SITUATION

A long-range problem of the so-called nursing situation has to do with semantics

as much as anything else. Twenty-five or 30 years ago the standard worker on the floor of the hospital was the so-called trained nurse. This individual had 3 years of training and, during her training years, she worked on the floors of the hospital in a manner similar to a graduate trained nurse. As time has gone by, the trained nurses have understandably tried to raise the standards of their group. This has resulted in an attempt to have their graduate nurses, in as many instances as possible, have a college degree. The result of this is that these individuals are equipped to do administrative work as well as to perform nursing functions. Now rather than just a graduate trained nurse, what we have is a medical administrator with a degree.

UPGRADING POLICY BOTH GOOD AND BAD

This upgrading policy has resulted in two things: A lack of nurses to perform the functions which they formerly did, and a highly trained individual capable of doing administrative work and who might prefer to do it to bedside care.

In the long range it would be better if these highly trained folks were replaced in the hospital by a new category, technically trained to take care of patients and not so interested in administration.

This is not intended to reflect on the desire of the current nurse program to upgrade themselves and who are in a certain sense changing their hospital function. On the other hand, the long range program should take cognizance of this change and immediately have an explosive expansion in the schools which train young women to take care of patients at the bedside.

POSSIBLE PLAN TO SOLVE CRISIS

The Pulaski County Medical Society has felt the nursing shortage acutely and, as a result, has had some exploratory meetings with interested parties. At one of these meetings, J. A. Gilbreath (Arkansas Baptist Medical Center administrator) suggested the following plan, which is an adaptation of one proposed some months ago by Mrs. Mildred Armour (head of Arkansas Baptist School of Nursing).

The plan is aimed at conserving teaching personnel. It was suggested that since most paramedical personnel have the same basic didactic needs, that a formula be worked out whereby there is a year's course in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, etc., which would be identical for nurses, technicians, etc. At the end of the first year, if any of these individuals desire to stop their training, they would be qualified as a 1-year nurse technician.

Some individuals might want to take 2 years' training.

It is important to point out that if this individual is in the nurse training plan, she would be performing bedside nursing in moderate amounts; this is a necessary aspect of the program for both the hospital and the individual. Lastly, some individuals would want to take 3 years' training and receive a designation equivalent to a graduate nurse technician or some other appropriate designation.

For this plan to work in a satisfactory manner, there would have to be some means of licensing these officials on a statewide basis if not on a national basis. Thus, the trainee could obtain employment at the proper level of competence in any hospital throughout the State and, if this plan were used nationally, the trainee could be employed in other States at an equal stage of training.

This plan need not to be in conflict with the so-called registered nurse training program but would be an additional training program [for] specialists in bedside care with emphasis on practical nursing rather than on college-type education as advocated by the existing registered nurse associations for their members.

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on the last day of April, the distinguished American and, I am proud to say, fellow Kansan, Alf Landon, spoke before the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters on the momentous changes taking place in policies and decisions of governments around the globe and their interacting impacts—with special emphasis directed to the impact of and the impact on our Nation's international position.

Because Governor Landon's comments are both thoughtful and timely, I ask unanimous consent that his recent address be printed at this point in the RECORD so that all of us might have the benefit of his observations in the vital and tension-ridden areas of international relations which necessarily dominates so many of our considerations these days.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(By Alf M. Landon, Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters, Pittsburg, Kans., Apr. 30, 1966)

I am going to attempt briefly to clarify the impact on the United States of our international position on momentous changes taking place in policies and decisions by governments throughout the world—a world that has been made smaller due to modern transportation and communication—also a world growing bigger as nations develop in Africa-Asia and the great countries to the south of us. There are more undeveloped natural resources and land in that great area than in the rest of the world put together.

Just as the printing press brought about revolutionary changes in economic and political life in the Old World in the Middle Ages—so is the radio today—with its transistor—revolutionizing economic and political life for the illiterate peoples of the modern world from pole to pole.

It is interesting that the first grab made in all attempts to gain control of a government by force today is the radio station as the center of communications—instead of the transportation center. The radio station is the only means of reaching the people of a country involved to convey the political objectives, ideals, and motives of the leaders of the new crowd.

It is also interesting to note that radio in those countries has not changed the style of presentation by the speakers—like it has in America. In our country, it has eliminated the old-fashioned type of oratory. The limitations of radio and television time compel the speaker to put his thinking down in a manuscript so that he says in much less time what he is talking about than did the stump speaker up to the event of the radio.

Of course, there still remains the question of getting to the point that he's trying to convey. I remember the old story of two men listening to a candidate speaking from the back of a wagon on a street corner. Finally, one said to his neighbor, "What's he talking about?" The other fellow answered, "He don't say yet."

The great blackout through the failure of electric power over a wide area in the Northeast probably would have been our country's greatest domestic tragedy if it had not been for radio stations maintained by auxiliary power and radio transistors.

The confusion and uncertainty existing in Washington and throughout our great and beloved country—because of conflicting statements by the Johnson administration on its Vietnam policies—is being currently

noted and vigorously protested by leaders of President Johnson's own party—in and out of the Congress—and the situation is coming to a head.

I am only going to mention Vietnam as it relates to the world in the area of our foreign policies.

We have our President saying our objective is remaking that little unhappy country in our own image.

We have his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, saying at the last meeting of NATO in France, and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that we are in South Vietnam in extension of our containment of communism policy for America's and the free world's interest and in commitment of our obligations as a member of SEATO—South-east Asia Treaty Organization.

We have our President asking for aid and assistance from other signatures to that treaty.

Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Korea, and Thailand have responded in varying degrees. Therefore, all these governments will of course have a right to expect to be consulted regarding any negotiations that include Hanoi and the Vietcong.

Now Premier Ky has called—at our prodding and encouragement—two conventions to draft the first constitution in all South Vietnam's history preliminary to the first general election in all its history on August 15.

We have President Johnson's glowing description of the Vietnamese Government and Great Society that is going to emerge—with our aid—from that election—which is to be a free expression of the Vietnamese people's will.

I do not believe the situation in South Vietnam is stable enough to sustain that overly optimistic statement.

The President is reported to be warning administration circles to be prepared for the possibility that a new civilian facade of that government might not continue the war for South Vietnamese nationalism.

With the Vietcong completely occupying most of South Vietnam and able to arouse the rest—with the pressure the military juntas army and the organized Buddhists can and will use at the polls on election day in the areas they control—how can there be any semblance of a free election—or a fair election?

Then the big question is whether the Vietcong will be a part of any civilian government. If they are—that means sooner or later a Communist take-over of that government. Secretary Rusk said in February before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "To suggest that they (the Vietcong) represent the aspirations of the Vietnamese people is absurd."

Yet—Arthur Goldberg—America's Ambassador to the United Nations—when asked 3 weeks ago if the Vietcong were to be included in the planning for the first constitutional South Vietnamese Government—answered, "That is an academic question."

Secretary of Defense McNamara—2 weeks ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—said—in answer to Senator GORE—that he did not object to the Vietcong taking off their uniforms and voting in their pajamas.

It should be remembered that 24 hours or so after Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's statement in February in favor of settling the Vietnamese war by a coalition government that included the Vietcong—Mr. Moyer, the President's press secretary, said there was no broad difference between Mr. Johnson and Senator KENNEDY. Both agreed that any coalition government would have to be ratified by a general election.

At that time, Vice President HUMPHREY rightly compared letting the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese Government to letting a fox in the chicken coop. There would be no

chickens left. Or to an arsonist in the fire department.

If that coalition government including the Vietcong occurs, neither the containment policy nor the objectives of the Great Society itself will be attained.

Momentous decisions are building inside and outside of South Vietnam that can well be a turning point in all Asia. The key question is political. That is the participation of the Vietcong in the new government.

Little Vietnam—a country of only 15 or so million population—has no strategic military or economic value—no natural resources—compared with Indonesia. The most important event in all Asia since the Chinese nuclear bomb in October 1964, is the recent nationalistic revolt against Communist domination in Indonesia. That country—with the fifth largest population in the world—stretching out for 3,000 miles—with immense natural resources—is the strategic key to southeast Asia.

It is obvious that the answers to questions raised on our South Vietnam policy are not simple. It is obvious they are complex and many peoples are involved.

There is a growing urgent call for an "agonizing reappraisal of our Vietnam policies."

I believe that is too narrow a focus. I do believe there is urgent need for a realistic reappraisal of our present foreign policy and international relations, where crucial decisions are building up the world over in the light of the changing foreign policies of our allies and friends who are joined with us in the common defense of freedom and democratic processes of government from domination by communistic tyranny.

Let us now look briefly and objectively at recent major developments with momentous implications announced in the foreign policies of two of our closest allies.

First there is France. I do not share Secretary of State Rusk's optimism on President de Gaulle's dismissal of NATO forces from France—even though all the other NATO governments are sticking together so far.

Secretary Rusk recently said: "Fourteen nations, comprising 450 million people possessing massive military power, will not be paralyzed by the attitude of France."

Pulling out the American airfields and backup military bases and supply depots in France creates a crucial military logistic problem. Our main supply lines for our 250,000 American soldiers now stationed in West Germany cross France from French ports.

Even though all the other government members of NATO are willing to make their countries available—at the best we would have jerrybuilt logistic supply lines to West Germany that for sure would be vulnerable in time of war or threats of war.

Political decisions involved are equally important. According to the AP account of its interview with the French Foreign Minister, he "stressed that France intends to remain a part of the North Atlantic Treaty signed in 1949. France is divorcing itself only from the military organization which was set up after the treaty went into force and was not specifically mentioned in the pact. The United States does not draw this distinction between the treaty and the military organization, saying that a linking of the two is essential."

Now, let us take a good look at the changes Prime Minister Wilson has announced in England's foreign policy in his recent white paper. I quote from Joseph C. Harsch, long head of the Christian Science Monitor's London bureau and now on its Washington staff:

"Britain has clearly opted out of the world salvation business. There is not one word, one whiff, one faint smell of ideological Armageddon in the whole of the white paper.

"It would be difficult to draft two more different views of the world and responsi-

bility to it than the one in the British white paper and the other in the recent pronouncements of President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk in Washington.

"The Johnson-Rusk papers assume a world locked in grim ideological conflict. Mr. Wilson's white paper assumes a reasonably stable world in which the most important part, Europe, is for the moment quiet and relatively safe. The rest, Asia and Africa, is unsettled, but not of major concern.

"Washington and London are on divergent paths."

Analyzing the changing world around us, U Thant—Secretary General of the United Nations—said a few weeks ago:

"One lesson we can draw from the Vietnamese crisis, and for that matter from developments in many parts of the world today, is the fact that nationalism is still the most potent force in the life of a people. Whether you assess the situation in Vietnam or Syria or Ghana or Indonesia or elsewhere, I think historians may draw one conclusion: That nationalism, more than any political belief or political ideology or political conviction, is the most potent force in the life of a people.

"This applies equally to Africa or to Latin America or even to Europe. I think it is misleading to think primarily in terms of political ideologies in the context of the newly emerging nations."

So we find President de Gaulle, Prime Minister Wilson, and Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant—agreeing that nationalism is the basic motivating foreign policy of all the governments in the world—while American foreign policy is still based on past concepts.

The nationalistic trend in the world is not a question of whether we like to see that or not. There isn't anything we can do about it. It simply is a drastic change in international relations the world over. Whether it is good or bad—we must adjust our foreign policies to it.

Nationalism is forcing a complete reversal in the Soviet's foreign policy based on control and domination of international relations for all the Communist bloc. More and more, the erstwhile Russian colonies are asserting their independence of the Soviet in both domestic and foreign policies. Therefore, the Soviet is forced to modify its international relations—as it has been forced to swing toward the individual incentive profit motives of capitalism by the failure of the Marxian-Lenin theories to work in that field also.

China—after its break away from Russia—struck out on its world conquering plans based on the old Marxian-Lenin theory of "decadent democracies and capitalistic principles." It accused Russia of being a traitor to the original Communist theories of conquering the world by force.

Despite the fact that China has met with one disastrous defeat after another in the rising tide of nationalism in Africa and Asia—despite the failure in its attempt to dominate those countries through subversion, murder and assassination, which reached a climax in Indonesia—and despite the fact that it is today practically isolated from the rest of the world—China shows no signs of changing its foreign plans of world conquest.

The United States has ignored this development of vigorous—enthusiastic nationalistic trend all over the world.

Our international objective throughout our entire history has never been one of conquest and domination—like that of Russia and China. Rather, it has been to raise the standards of living—to spread the democratic processes by education—by technical training—by the greatest economic aid program the world has ever known.

As a matter of fact, this new nationalism is a horse of a different color from the old dynastic political and military ambitions and

colonial policies that infected the old world for many centuries.

This new nationalism is not threatening the world's peace—except as Russia and China attempt to use it to foster their Marxian-Lenin theories of world conquest.

Russia has found those theories will not work any better in foreign policies than they have in domestic policies. Chinese leaders must be reevaluating their position in the world today.

Infiltrating the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese Government is the only place where they can get at least a color of victory in world affairs.

Therefore, the adjustment in our international relations does not require the drastic reversal in our policies that it demands for Russia and China. The only adjustment we need is to recognize its existence—that it is not the threat to world peace—unless China or Russia use it for their purpose of world domination. So far, it has worked the opposite to wreck that goal.

Isn't it high time that we Americans realized we are isolating ourselves from countries whose agreement and support on international positions and policies we need?

I believe all three of our last Presidents have missed opportunities for influencing the establishment of a stable and therefore peaceful world. General Eisenhower with his "brinkmanship"; Mr. Kennedy with his "grand design"; and President Johnson with his negative rejection in October 1964, of China's proposal for a meeting of the five nuclear powers preliminary to a meeting of all the world governments for discussing abolition of nuclear weapons. France and Russia accepted. England did not, although that reversed all the previous political and personal positions of Prime Minister Wilson.

We must not allow differences with France and England to grow. We must seek to mobilize the unity of the free world—even though that requires a readjustment on our part of differing views of responsibility for a reasonably stable world.

The NATO countries need us. We need them—including France. To let existing divisions in NATO grow unresolved is to court disaster for all. This is no time for mutual polemics or satirical comments between France and America—two of the key countries in the economic and peaceful life of the world.

The latest case in illustration of the need to readjust our international relations is the resignation last Tuesday of nine representatives of the great countries to the south of us on the Alliance for Progress panel. They resigned in protest against U.S. domination.

They need the United States of America. America needs them. They are close to home on this hemisphere.

However, America's military power must be maintained second to none. It is extremely useful and necessary in maintaining a balance of power still essential to preventing world war three.

That does not mean that the world's peace can be kept only by military force. It does mean that it is a great help in stabilizing situations.

I am increasingly concerned about America's position in the major developments that are taking place in a fermenting world—in which we seem to be getting every day closer to some irreversible position—and the fragmentation of the free nations bloc—as we have come seriously close in Vietnam.

I believe that the world's problems can be kept manageable for peace by sound pragmatic policies that are based neither on overreliance on military power—nor the millennium claimed for the United Nations—nor the illusions of free elections in the midst of terror.

Big spending in foreign aid programs is not a substitute for equity in a foreign policy.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN WILL NOT SEEK REELECTION

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened by the news that my good friend and esteemed colleague, Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, of Albany, N.Y., will not seek reelection this year.

Hawaii has had many great friends. History will some day record that LEO O'BRIEN was one of our greatest friends.

When Congressman O'BRIEN leaves Congress at the close of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, he will have completed nearly 14 years of faithful service to the people of New York's 29th Congressional District, to the people of the State of New York, and to his Nation. He will be remembered for all his good works by many countless thousands of people, and he will be forever remembered by the people of Hawaii as the stalwart defender and advocate of Hawaii's bid for statehood.

LEO O'BRIEN had the distinction of serving as the floor manager of the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills.

Therefore, Mr. President, may I, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, say mahalo to LEO O'BRIEN, and to wish him the very best in the years to come.

LEO O'BRIEN is truly one of the finest men I have ever met along life's pathway.

Mr. President, recently John Hall, a young man who covers Hawaiian matters in Washington for the United Press International, described his day with LEO O'BRIEN. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's article, as published in the Honolulu Advertiser, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS TIME "THE IRISHMAN" MEANS IT
(By John Hall)

WASHINGTON.—"It's sort of a cry-wolf proposition," LEO O'BRIEN said, with that straightforward permanently creased Irish smile. "I've said I'm going to quit so often that nobody pays any attention. But I mean it this time."

The newspapermen had started calling him that morning after the story of his retirement broke in Albany.

Now it was 2 p.m. The buzzer on his office phone was still ringing regularly.

"Hello Dick * * * Yes, it's true * * * the thing is that one of my grandchildren grew a foot while I was away last time. They're always out skiing or something on weekends when I'm home. I want to be there to see them grow inch by inch.

"Annoyance," the moonfaced Irishman said thoughtfully, as he hung up the phone and straightened a stack of papers on his desk in the Rayburn Building. "Annoyance was what got me into the statehood fight. In 1955, Clair Engle was chairman of the Interior Committee and Clair took the statehood bills away from my subcommittee. He wouldn't let me hold hearings—did it himself. The bill went to the floor and got recommitted overwhelmingly.

"The following year, Clair handed me that tired old rubber ball that had been bouncing futilely down here for 40 years. You know, the theory always had been that Hawaii should be admitted first because it was more prosperous. But I decided to take that cart and—hold on a second.

"Hi, Tom * * * pretty good. Yeah, that word veteran gets me. I quit the news-

paper business because they were calling me a veteran reporter. Now they're calling me a veteran Congressman."

"Now, let me see * * *. So I decided to put that cart before the horse and make it run * * *. Make Alaska the needle and Hawaii the thread. Hawaii was terribly annoyed * * * but we got the Alaska bill on the floor and, after 6 days of debate, it passed. Of course, Hawaii couldn't be turned down then. And the next year, in 1959, Hawaii was admitted.

"Everybody was afraid of any implication of communism in Hawaii. Of course, it wasn't true. But we just couldn't get the bill through, so we did it backward and it worked.

"I came down here in 1952. Did you know I was scooped on my own election? I had to stay on as a reporter at the statehouse. I was running because I was the only one who knew anything about the bills that were pending. I was elected on April Fool's Day. On election night, my editor messaged 'Opposition reporting you elected.'

"Anyway, I came down here and they tossed me on Interior. If there is one committee remote from my district, it was that one. But I figured there were a lot of ambitious, western guys on there and I would move fast. I did, and in 6 years I was second ranking member and chairman of the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee."

The phone was buzzing again.

"Charlie, how are you? * * * Yeah, I want to go soak up some friendship * * *. Well, I enjoy the rumors and it might be smart to get someone from upstate to run. But this has no connection whatsoever, although I don't know a better way of being with your family than being Lieutenant Governor. It's the best form of social security. But 32 years with a title, then to go back to 'Hey, you * * *' I don't know * * * this even sounds phony to me, as a former reporter, but I just want to be with my family. Maybe I'll do a little writing, some TV work if anyone wants me. Thanks, Charlie * * * bye.

"Well, anyway, I'm proud of the part I had in the statehood bills. But you know, dealing with individuals is just as important a part of being a congressman. One night the doorbell rang and a fellow asked for my help. He'd been accused of deserting the Army—the poor fellow couldn't read or write. His bedridden, domineering mother had told him he had been discharged. He didn't have a friend. I went down to his court-martial and they gave him 6 years at hard labor, just because I was there. I finally got it commuted to time served and the poor fellow is back with his family."

FACTS (UNPLEASANT) ON FARM PRICES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with parity dropping another two points in April we confront a situation where parity prices for farmers are down to 80 percent and still the attacks on American agriculture continue to be made by this administration in an effort to blame our farmers and ranchers for the fast burning fires of inflation which are destroying the purchasing power of our American dollar.

However, the facts and figures available from the various agencies of our Government indicate with complete clarity that American agriculture is actually the victim rather than the villain of the inflation which the reckless spending programs of this Johnson administration have stimulated.

In this connection, a significant and factual editorial from one of the great

newspapers published in the heartland of America's agricultural area provides some thoughtful reading. I commend it to the Congress and the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., entitled "Facts on Farm Prices" be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON FARM PRICES

The Farm Journal for May points out some facts and figures which should be informative to city folk as well as farmers. They were gleaned from reports of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

For example:

The prices farmers received for all products in 1965 were 8.93 percent below the prices of 1947-49.

Consumers in 1966 are spending 18.2 percent of their disposable income for food, as compared to 20 percent 5 years ago.

Food prices in retail markets are 17.1 percent higher than in 1947-49, but costs added after the food items leave the farm have increased by 41 percent.

In the period from 1947 to 1949 to 1965, weekly wage rates to labor have gone up 107 percent, and prices of things farmers buy have increased by 28.3 percent.

All of which leads to some wonderment as to why the President should blame food prices for inflation, and makes enigmatic the Secretary of Agriculture's recent expression of pleasure that "farm prices in certain key items have moderated" from "cyclical highs which have accounted for most of the consumer food increases."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL PROJECT—S. 2721

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, just last week I was honored with the opportunity of addressing the student body at George Washington University on the occasion of its annual Law Day ceremonies. In my opening remarks I noted the general theme of Law Day for this year, "Respect the Law—It Respects You," and pointed out that in recent years it has become increasingly apparent "that the law is a respecter of persons—that the law as administered in this country often operates to favor the rich litigant over the poor litigant," and that "this favoritism tends to be a built-in factor of our legal system of any adversary system in fact."

Therefore, in pursuance of this thought today, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the fact that in recent years the spotlight of inequitable treatment of the poor in our legal system has been focused upon the inequities and injustices inherent in our present financial bail system. Indeed, the system's many critics have long decried the anachronism whereby the primary and often sole criteria for an accused's pretrial release is the price of a bond or a bond premium, when it has been evident for some time that factors other than financial consideration may give greater assurance of the accused's return for trial and allow the poor and rich man alike to obtain his pretrial release based upon conditions justly imposed by law without a price tag.

Since 1961, through the efforts of many lawyers, judges, and public officials throughout the country, research and demonstration projects have been set up at least in 50 major cities in our Nation to test the theory that strong community ties provide a good and safe assurance of a defendant's return for trial, and that therefore he can be released on bail without requiring a traditional financial bond.

As a result of an extensive study of the bail system in the District of Columbia in 1962 by the junior bar section of the District of Columbia Bar Association jointly with the Judicial Conference for the District of Columbia Circuit, a bail project was established to conduct such a demonstration in the District of Columbia.

This project, funded by a Ford Foundation grant to Georgetown University, has been in actual operation in the courts of the District of Columbia since January of 1964, and through periodic reports since then it has demonstrated beyond question the reliability of the community tie factor as a reasonable alternative to the traditional financial bond system in assuring that qualified defendants will return for trial.

Most recent statistics indicate that the District of Columbia bail project has recommended the release on personal bond to the courts of over 2,290 persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors, and that the courts have accepted approximately 85 percent of these recommendations, allowing almost 2,000 persons to be released without the necessity of having to pay a price for their pretrial freedom.

In the careful recording of the program's operational statistics, the District of Columbia bail project reports that 56 persons, or approximately 2.9 percent have failed to make required court appearances after release on personal bond. However, it is interesting to note that 44 such defaulters have been returned to custody, 38 of whom were rearrested in the Washington, D.C., area. There has been extensive coverage of this project's activities both in the local and national press media and it appears that it has been overwhelmingly accepted in the District of Columbia.

Congress has already recognized the need for reform of this unfair monetary bail system and has incorporated the substantive aspects of bail reform measures tested by the District of Columbia bail project and more than 50 other similar type projects throughout the country, in legislation now pending final enactment.

Last September, the Senate passed and sent to the House the Bail Reform Act, S. 1357, which in essence requires all Federal courts, including the court of general sessions for the District of Columbia, to give greater priority to personal recognizance releases and other types of conditional releases short of the traditional financial bond releases.

Just a few days ago, this bill was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and it appears that final passage will not be long delayed.

It should be noted, however, that S. 1357 indicates broadly to the Federal courts the basic guidelines for determining an individual's qualifications for personal recognizance or other non-financial conditional releases. It requires the judicial officer in making such a bail determination to take into account from available information: the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of the evidence against the accused, the accused's family ties, employment, financial resources, character and mental condition, the length of his residence in the community, record of convictions, and his record of appearances for court proceedings or flight to avoid prosecution or failure to appear at court appearances.

Unquestionably this legislation will be a great step forward in assuring the American people of equal justice under law by providing much of the needed improvement in the administration of criminal justice in our courts and thereby eliminate a major part of the area of favoritism which I spoke of at George Washington University.

What is now apparent, however, is that the Bail Reform Act will require certain machinery to properly effectuate the legislative reform goals intended. In short, in order for the courts to make rational determinations with the guidelines set forth in S. 1357, it will be necessary to obtain quickly and efficiently all the necessary background information concerning the accused. It would be folly to suggest that the already overworked and understaffed judges of our Federal courts, especially in the District of Columbia and more specifically in the court of general sessions, now have the time and facilities available to them to investigate adequately the accused's family background and history and all the other information required to properly implement the dictates of the Bail Reform Act.

Mr. President, what is needed is already in active use today in our Federal City in the form of the District of Columbia bail project. For, in addition to this project's great work in testing and establishing the reliability of the community tie and nonfinancial condition thesis, it has also demonstrated more than adequately that the very machinery used by the project in its experiment can be and is the necessary adjunct to the Bail Reform Act.

In May of 1965, the Judicial Conference for the District of Columbia Circuit, which was greatly responsible for initiating this fine project, went on record as urging Congress to enact legislation to provide a proper vehicle to effectuate the experimentally tested procedures on a permanent basis. A bill, S. 2721, which incorporates such a proposal has already been introduced in the Senate and is now being considered by the District of Columbia Committee. This bill provides for the establishment of a bail agency in the District of Columbia, and if enacted into law, the courts of this city would have the necessary arm outside the adversary system to gather and verify factual data concerning defendants for the purpose of

making proper bail determinations. Hearings have already been held on S. 2721 and it is my understanding that these hearings produced no opposition to it.

Recently President Lyndon B. Johnson in a special message to Congress urged the speedy enactment of this legislation. Therefore, I add my voice to those of the many other persons who have gone on record favoring the enactment of this legislation.

Recently it has been announced in the Washington newspapers that the District of Columbia bail projects grant will expire in September 1966, and it is already cutting back on its much needed services in the courts. Unless Congress acts to establish a permanent bail agency which will assume the very worthwhile functions already begun by this project, I believe that much of the bail reform intended by S. 1357 will not be carried out in the District of Columbia.

In the past few months, I made two special trips to the District of Columbia jail for the purpose of personally inspecting its much publicized overcrowded facilities. These visits made it perfectly clear to me that there is a pressing need to alleviate these overcrowded conditions and the most immediate remedy certainly has to be to effectuate the release of more people awaiting trial who are now languishing in that jail for long periods of time because they cannot afford bail or bond premiums.

Accordingly, I must urge that the Senate District Committee consider S. 2721 as a matter of priority, that it be approved by the committee as soon as possible, and passed by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

THE ULTIMATE BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this is No. 743,096,481, formerly known as the junior Senator from Missouri, rising to the floor. Before I begin my remarks I want to compliment my good friend and colleague, No. 2,675,030,666, formerly known as the senior Senator from Rhode Island, for those excellent remarks just made. I also want to point out to Senator No. 6,438,772,194 that he is in error. I have recently spoken to my constituents, Nos. 714,346; 348,642; 743,821; and 348,643, and they have assured me on this point.

Mr. President, before I create another man from Mars scare, I want to clarify my last statement. Recently, we have been warned that a Federal Data Center is being planned, into which all information about our individual citizens will be fed. Our citizens will lose the little individualism they now have, and they will become merely a number which can be fed into this computer. One scientist, Dr. Orville G. Brim, Jr., head of the Russell Sage Foundation, has called this central agency that would pool all the public and private records on our citizens a Government dossier bank. Dr. Brim commented that:

There is no doubt that we can run the society better with this information, but doing this would well be in conflict with all our fears of having privacy.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure intends to study this so-called Federal Data Center very carefully. Somewhere along the line toward Government efficiency we must cease pushing our citizens into the computer.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on this subject which appeared in the recent May 16, 1966, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report,
May 16, 1966]

A GOVERNMENT WATCH ON 200 MILLION AMERICANS?

Your life story may be on file with the Government before long, subject to official scrutiny at the push of a button. That's the trend.

It can lead to a data bank in Washington, storing up facts on everybody's records on schooling, jobs, taxes, arrests, other information.

Alarms are being sounded about the growing interest of the Government in private lives of its citizens.

A record of every important fact about every individual in the Nation, from the cradle to the grave, is gradually being built by Government.

Now there is talk of a Federal data center into which all or part of this information could be fed.

Here in one place could be a dossier bank on each of the Nation's nearly 200 million people. That bank would grow with the population and the growing volume of data on each individual.

Press a button and out could come the life story of any person, to be used for purposes of the Government.

Here could be tax records, records of any brushes with the law from traffic violations to indiscretions in youth or old age, school records, records of any personal transactions involving the Government.

Possibilities of abuse are described as extensive.

Even now, there are reports that income tax information—supposedly inviolate—is used at times to bring pressure on men in public office or businessmen who may not cooperate with men in high office.

It is promised that a data center for Government will be hedged about by assurances against abuse.

It is recalled, however, that Government promises often prove not to be permanently binding.

When the social security program was enacted 30 years ago, there was assurance that the social security number of an individual would be used only to identify his account.

Today the social security number is on most tax returns. Banks and businesses use people's social security numbers when reporting interest and dividend payments to the Internal Revenue Service. That number has become a universal identification number around which the lifetime record of every individual can be built.

Plans taking shape for the 1970 census suggest an interest in obtaining much more information about individuals, including possibly, their religious affiliations. The promise is made that this information would be kept inviolate.

However, some officials feel that the temptation would be to feed census information, coded to a person's social security number, into the Federal data center.

The trend in all government—local, State, Federal—is to centralize information on individuals.

Fingerprint files of the FBI now total more than 167 million. A nationwide system of crime reporting is being built around communication circuits and electronic computers.

Into the FBI, too, flows information about many individuals in a wide cross section of society. Much of this information is in "raw" form—unevaluated.

This question is asked: Could information of this type, much of it gossip, find its way into a central computer mechanism of the Government?

The Federal Government itself is moving its police power into wider and wider fields.

The number of FBI agents is to be increased, if President Johnson has his way, to step up enforcement of civil rights laws. Businessmen are finding Government more and more directly involved in policing their labor relations and their hiring practices.

Reports multiply involving more and more individuals.

All can be fed into the vast complex of computers that Government is building and now is thinking of centralizing.

WHY SOME ARE ALARMED

The potentials of this whole developing trend are alarming to a growing number of individuals who are aware of what is happening. This alarm grows from the possibility of abuse in a period when the Government shows what has been described as an expanding tendency to use its power against individuals.

Some in business recall how FBI agents swept into steel company offices in 1962 demanding records without a search warrant. President Kennedy, the night before, had used TV to attack this industry's announced price increase.

Other businessmen are aware of instances in which the Internal Revenue Service used the most modern techniques for "bugging" private conferences.

Information gathered in these and many other ways, say those who are concerned, might be fed into a computer system to build a dossier bank on individuals.

The growing use of computers by the Government brings this warning from Dr. Roger Revelle, director of Harvard's Center for Population Studies: "What happens to the citizen when his identity and every detail of his life are coded and classified in the Government's computing system? * * * Not only does it become impossible to cheat even in a piddling sort of way on your income tax, it becomes impossible to do almost anything without the Government knowing about it, and knowledge is liable to lead inevitably to control."

Dr. Orville G. Brim, Jr., head of the Russell Sage Foundation in New York, has dubbed a central agency that would pool all the public records on each citizen a "Government dossier bank."

Dr. Brim makes this comment: "There is no doubt that we can run the society better with this information, but doing this could well be in conflict with all our fears of having privacy invaded."

Dr. Brim would have the Government separate the identity of individuals from the mass of statistics it collects. "We must protect the individual against the chance of raiding parties by unscrupulous politicians," he says.

A New York sociologist puts the potential danger this way: "To the extent that knowledge is power, he who has access to dossiers has power."

TASK FORCE AT WORK

Proposals for a Federal data center have been made to the U.S. Budget Bureau by two private study groups. The idea now is being

considered by a top-level task force appointed by President Johnson.

Initially, the proposed data center would pull together in one place all the statistics collected by more than 20 Federal agencies. Among the major departments: Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Reserve Board.

A survey shows that these agencies have 100 million punch cards and 30,000 computer tapes crammed with information about people and business.

A data center, it is argued, would bring more efficient recordkeeping for the Nation. At present there is said to be much overlapping and waste in collection of statistics and reports.

Material fed into computers at the data center would be available within Government and to business, research groups, and State and local agencies.

Precautions would be taken in the data center so that Federal officials would not make available any confidential material, according to officials.

HELP FOR PHYSICIANS

Also under consideration within Government is an idea for a medical data bank. This would set up on computer tapes the medical histories of all Americans. At the push of a button, a doctor could get the complete file on a patient—his illnesses, operations, shots taken, and the like.

This comment on a medical data bank was made by a doctor who knows about proposals to set one up:

"It would be a great thing. Computers do not forget the way patients often do. Material being fed into a data bank could help us spot an epidemic almost as soon as it got started."

But, again, dangers are cited of possible misuse of a medical data bank. As one doctor put it—

"Let's assume an individual had a nervous breakdown years ago, with subsequent complete recovery. Or even that the person contracted a social disease in his youth.

"Is this medical record to pop out of a computer at the touch of a button, say, by that person's employer? What might such medical information mean to an unscrupulous politician out to 'get' an opponent? Rigid safeguards would be needed to protect information in any medical bank."

Government officials say the idea of a medical data bank is still in the dream stage. However, one agency in Government already is sounding out computer manufacturers for cost estimates on equipment that would be needed.

OUT-OF-DATE DATA?

A major concern that is voiced about any data center is that it might contain out-of-date or questionable information that could prove harmful. As an example, a law professor is quoted recently as saying:

"I have filled out hundreds of detailed questionnaires on former students. My verdict on the emotional adjustment of a student I saw only in class may affect him for the rest of his life. It's damned unfair."

From a computer manufacturer's representative: "People change, yet there is the real possibility that records in a central file wouldn't be updated. Thus a bureaucrat passing on an application for a license, say, could turn down the applicant on the basis of something that happened years before, but which has no validity now."

A business executive worried about the trend toward central files tide to computers comments: "It is not going too far to see emerging the outlines of an all-knowing, all-seeing Government—Big Brother. Will college admission officials or employers eventually be going to a Government bureaucrat for clearance on young people under consideration?"

At bottom, the big worry is not the use of computers by Government. It's recognized that recordkeeping in today's complex world has reached the point where information can only be efficiently handled by high-speed computers.

SAFER ON TAPE?

"No one wants to wreck the machines that bring progress," says a Columbia University professor. He adds: "Information stored on a computer tape could be safer than material now in a file drawer.

"Codes can be devised so that computers will divulge information only to qualified recipients. Even among agencies of the Government there could be 'blocks' put into the computer system to prevent swapping of information—such as is now done to prevent Census Bureau material from getting into the hands of the Internal Revenue Service."

Still, growing numbers of people are concerned that safeguards on a central file could break down, that people in places of power would be able to get around restrictions. The most intimate details of people's lives might then be used for purposes much different from those intended.

Privacy of the citizen is seen as a protection against abuse of power. And a growing number of people see proposed data banks as posing a potential threat to that privacy.

Computers make it possible to set up central files on nearly 200 million Americans of the present and the added millions of the future. A Federal data center, now being proposed, would be built around the computer.

Washington today spends almost \$2 billion each year in operating computers and adding to its battery of nearly 2,500 computers.

Capacity to record, store, compare, and analyze bits of information is practically unlimited.

To show the speed involved: In 20 seconds a man with a pencil can add two 12-digit numbers.

A man with an adding machine can do 10 such sums in 20 seconds. A pioneer computer pushed that up to 100,000.

Latest computers will do 160 million such computations in 20 seconds.

It's the potential for keeping track of every move of every individual through a Government computer center that is causing warnings to be sounded.

One phase of the growing trend toward policing by Washington of all Americans is emphasized by a Senator. EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, put it this way:

"I must report to you that the right of privacy—the right to go into your home without the fear that someone is secretly watching your every move, the right to talk freely with your attorney, your banker, or your wife without the fear of a hidden recorder or transmitter—this right is today being dangerously and recklessly ignored and violated."

The Senator revealed: "Our investigations of Big Brother tactics by Federal agencies have turned up some really incredible things.

"For example, the fact that the Post Office was turning over first-class mail to the Internal Revenue Service, which, in turn, opened the letters.

"The Internal Revenue Service runs a snooping school where the agent's graduation present is a set of lock picks. This school is still in full operation.

"A retired officer of the Federal Narcotics Bureau told us that all of his agents wiretap, regardless of State and Federal law.

"One year ago the IRS told us they did not have 'bugs' in conference rooms where attorneys meet with clients. Then, after my investigations, they admitted they had a few. * * * After we did some more investigating, they admitted that in 22 cities they had

bugged conference rooms and, in 10 cities, conference rooms with see-through mirrors that permit agents to spy on taxpayers.

"We found * * * one private company which had sold nearly \$100,000 worth of snooping equipment to 10 Federal agencies. Most of these Federal agencies had absolutely nothing to do with national defense or national security."

If the Government does set up a central file or dossier bank of personal data on people, there will be a huge store of information at hand to feed into it.

It will only be necessary to comb the records already gathered by public agencies—Federal, State, and local—and assemble these records in one place. Most people probably would be surprised to know how much information is on file about them. For example:

Census data: Every census gathers more detailed data than the preceding one. In 1960, controversy developed over questions about incomes and other personal data. Even more information will be sought in 1970.

Taxes: In files of the Internal Revenue Service there are the most minute details of people's private affairs. Nobody has any secrets from the tax collector.

Social security: In these files are data on 160 million people, living and dead.

Bank accounts: Federal agencies supervise banks and have access to records of deposits and other data.

Fingerprints: The FBI has more than 167 million sets of fingerprints.

Armed Forces: Detailed records, showing all manner of information on the millions who have served in the military, are in the official files.

Security: Extensive files are gathered on people who apply for any of the 3 million Federal jobs requiring security clearance.

Police: Millions of Americans are in the files of the police for various reasons, including offenses or indiscretions of long ago.

Schools: Courses, grades, I.Q.-test scores, personality profiles, teachers' evaluations—all this is only a portion of the records kept on those who go through school.

Drivers: The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has a master file, on computer tapes, of all drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked because of involvement in a fatal accident or drunken driving.

That's just a sample of the data now kept on people. More detailed information is being compiled all the time. With computers and central files, it would be the work of a split second to tap this store of data on almost any person in the country.

FRANCIS BELLAMY

Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. President, Francis Bellamy, clergyman and editor, led a full and varied life of 76 years; a Baptist minister for 12 years, serving successively as pastor of three churches; staff member and contributor to the Youth's Companion and to various other publications for another 12 years; advertising editor with Everybody's Magazine for 11 years; and advertising account executive for a final 6 years before his retirement. This was a life of service and achievement, marked by concern for social welfare, for the education of youth, and for political responsibility. Francis Bellamy's talent for concise statement, and his heartfelt passion for his native land, fused once in that noble and powerful statement for which his name is remembered today, the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. This statement, as Bellamy composed it for the national public schools celebration of Columbus

Day in 1892, sponsored by Youth's Companion, read:

I pledge allegiance to my flag—and to the Republic for which it stands—one Nation indivisible—with liberty and justice for all.

Today we have altered the phrase, "my flag," to "the flag of the United States of America," and we have added the words "under God." Otherwise, the pledge remains as Bellamy wrote it, and this pledge, and the spirit of loyalty which it inspires and expresses, stands today as a lasting memorial to the great soul and penetrating mind of Francis Bellamy. It is fitting that this Nation, to which he wrote so fine a tribute, should rejoice upon the anniversary of his birth on May 18, 1855. I therefore wholeheartedly concur in the movement to declare May 18, 1966, Francis Bellamy Day.

MORE CHANGES, MORE CHANCES— A SPEECH OFF THE BEATEN TRACK

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, occasionally among the thousands of speeches heard in Washington each year, there is one so off the beaten track that it surprises, delights and cheers us. Such a speech was one given recently at the Magazine Publishers Association by Edward Weeks, the editor who made the Atlantic Monthly important reading for all of us over many years.

It concerns first the art of tombsmanship, a subject not recently discussed on the Senate floor but close to Mr. Weeks' heart because of his recent retirement. I defy any one to read it without smiling. A hearty laugh will follow when one reads his account of "naked diplomacy" during the Teddy Roosevelt administration and his description of one man at one desk in the State Department in 1937 "trying to cope with the riptide of Russian aggression."

Editor Weeks gives us an idea to brood over when he quotes Sir Oliver Franks on the danger of a diplomat being away from Washington at the moment that this country "wakes up and finds itself in agreement." He gives examples of the part magazines play in bringing the Nation's readers to "that instant of crystallization" of sentiment. He shows us some of the ways "our national confusion" gets resolved. He closes with a sentence about the United States which I believe any Member of the Senate—any official in a democracy—will cherish:

Gentlemen, if there is a more fearless and independent body of readers anywhere in the world, I would not know where to find it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD. I commend it to Senators. It is quite evident that our friend of the Atlantic Monthly—even in his "entombment"—maintains the knack of slipping a solid gold nugget into what seems only enchanting froth.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE CHANGES, MORE CHANCES

(By Edward Weeks)

Mr. Stein, honored guests, fellow publishers, and editors, I trust you all noticed how sympathetically Mr. Stein lowered his voice

when he came to my retirement. In no country in the world is the art of tombsmanship, the act of public embalming, so beautifully displayed as in the United States. It is true that the Soviet Union for a number of years spectacularly embalmed two of its national heroes, Lenin and Stalin, and when they found that Stalin's record would not wash they had him removed in the dead of night, and narrowed their display to one.

But in America every leader in his profession, every business executive, even an editor, as he passes the cutoff point of 65, is entombed, with a burst of fireworks. For an interval he is feted at receptions; he is given a Paul Revere bowl; his portrait is unveiled, there are banquets at which things are said about him which he may believe but his wife never—and then, like Stalin, he quietly sinks into the shadows. Not the Egyptians, not the Russians, not the Chinese will ever rival us at tombsmanship—and part of the artistry is that it is all wrapped up and over within a month.

Speaking of entombment may I divert your attention for a moment to the State Department. My friend, the former Ambassador William Phillips, is today one of the oldest living graduates of State; he began in 1903 as a private secretary to Ambassador Rufus Choate in London and his next post took him to Peking under our Minister, Mr. Rockhill. In his book, "Ventures in Diplomacy" Bill Phillips writes that when he began his duties in Washington 60 years ago the entire personnel of State numbered 167 persons and the diplomatic mail was delivered by an ancient Negro messenger who placed the envelopes in wire baskets hanging on the outside of the office doors, the baskets being marked, "Secret" and "Confidential." Teddy Roosevelt was then President and as Phillips played good tennis and liked to walk he was soon a member of what was called the "Tennis Cabinet." In the intimacy of the White House he heard T.R. tell of a tramp he had just taken with M. Jusserand, the French Ambassador. When they reached Rock Creek the President proposed that they swim across; he stripped, plunged in and was soon on the other bank. Whereupon the Ambassador followed suit but when he sputtered out of the water, like Teddy in the buff, it was seen that he had forgotten to remove his brown kid gloves. That happened 60 years ago in the days of what we might call, "naked diplomacy."

In 1937 when another Roosevelt was President we were seeking to persuade the Soviet Union to repay us for the American investments which had been confiscated during the revolution and our policy was based on a blend of martinis and soothing sirup which it was thought would make the Russians amenable. Indeed, the faith in F.D.R.'s influence over Stalin was such that the Russian division of the State Department was reduced to a single room containing two desks: at one desk sat the man who was in charge of our affairs with Poland; at the other sat George F. Kennan, a well-qualified but solitary diplomat who did not believe in the efficacy of soothing sirup. It seems hardly credible that less than 30 years ago we had one man at one desk trying to cope with the riptide of Russian aggression.

Today, although I am sure there are times when President Johnson must wish he could tell General de Gaulle to go jump in the Potomac, our Executive can no longer indulge in that form of "naked diplomacy." Nor does our State Department, now having a personnel of 15,000 in Washington, delegate the Russian problems to one man at one desk. I have used those two vignettes to illustrate how great a change has overtaken us since Pearl Harbor; never in history has a nation been obliged to accept such untested responsibilities as we have taken on in the past two decades.

In this world of urgency and peril, of belligerency and caution, of generosity as spontaneous as the Marshall plan, and of destruction as cynical as the defoliation in Vietnam, the magazine editor, like the members of Congress, must deal in futures, must live with crises which admit no quick solution, and must everlastingly seek for explanations his people will understand. To this task we must bring both vigilance and humility. And on Monday mornings which I find the most exhilarating in the week we bring something else: the realization that the more changes that occur the more chances we have of strengthening our American destiny.

A few years ago on the occasion of Walter Lippmann's 70th birthday the corps of journalists tendered him a luncheon at the National Press Club. It was not an entombment for everyone realizes that Walter is not replaceable. His response on this occasion is worth recalling:

"Last summer while walking in the woods and on the mountains where I live I found myself daydreaming about how I would answer, about how I would explain and justify, the business of being opinionated and of airing opinions regularly several times a week.

"Is it not absurd, I heard the critics saying, that anyone should think he knows enough to write so much about so many things? You write about foreign policy. Do you see the cables which pour into the State Department every day from all parts of the world? Do you attend the staff meetings of the Secretary of State and his advisers? Are you a member of the National Security Council, and what about all those other countries which you write about? Do you have the run of 10 Downing Street, and how do you listen in on the deliberations of the Presidium of the Kremlin? Why don't you admit that you are an outsider and that you are therefore by definition an ignoramus? How then do you presume to interpret, much less to criticize and to disagree with, the policy of your own Government, and for that matter of any other government?"

And he closed with words so honest and so searching that they brought a rising acclaim:

"If the country is to be governed with the consent of the governed, then the governed must arrive at opinions about what their governors want them to consent to."

We editors are always straining to reach the moment of crystallization, when readers will look up from our pages and say, "Yes, that is exactly what I think. That writer has added the whole thing up correctly." I remember hearing Sir Oliver Franks, when he was the British Ambassador in Washington, comment on the differences between the British and American democracy. He said, "One of the first things a diplomat in your country learns is not to be away from Washington for too long. You people have your own singular way of making up your minds. Things drift along in a seemingly aimless fashion in Congress and your commentators and editorial writers at many points of difference, and then all of a sudden one bright morning the country wakes up and finds itself in agreement. A consensus has been arrived at and the design accepted as if it came down from on high. A diplomat should not be away from your Capital when that moment occurs."

The magazine editor plays a powerful part in bringing readers to this instant of crystallization: it is his unique opportunity to provide the summation of a point of view. Each of us works this out in his own way. In the spring of 1940, in my third year as editor of the Atlantic, I heard that Nehru, president of the Nationalist Party in India, had been jailed by the British and I assumed that since he had time on his hands he might do a little writing for us. So I invited him

to do an article on the India which he saw emerging when the war was over. Only the British would have passed on such a request to a political prisoner, and only the British would have released to me the firmly reasoned, impassioned declaration of Indian independence which Nehru wrote. Even today Nehru's words have a bite as you can tell from this brief quotation:

"The tragedy is that Britain should have encouraged, and should continue to encourage, disruptive and reactionary tendencies in India in order to preserve her imperial interests. She will not preserve them, for they are destined to go, but they will go in hostility and conflict if no better way is found. The day when India could submit to external impositions is past."

The only thing wrong about this article was my timing; for it appeared in print less than a month before Dunkirk and when people had time to reflect they were so concerned with the future of Britain that they had small thought for the future of India. The Daily Worker was the only American periodical to notice Nehru's declaration of independence and they reprinted it in full without asking permission. Yet had I published this very same article at the war's end in 1945, it would have come far closer to the moment of truth.

But at the war's end there were two of my rivals who were unerring in their timing. When Harold Ross sent John Hersey to Hiroshima to do an anniversary article on that terrible cataclysm and then devoted an entire issue of the New Yorker to this shocking, pitiable story, he touched the American conscience to the quick. And when in July of 1947 Hamilton Fish Armstrong, the editor of Foreign Affairs, persuaded Mr. X, the nom de plume of George F. Kennan, to define "The Sources of Soviet Conduct"—and how they might be contained by the free world, that article paved the way for an agreement on "the containment policy," which has endured to this day.

The more changes, the more chances there are for an editor to resolve our national confusion. That is what John Fischer of Harper's did with the penetrating article, "The Illusion of American Omnipotence" by D. W. Brogan. It is what Max Ascoli did in the Reporter with his two unsparring articles on the China lobby. It is what James Shepley of Life did with his article, "How Dulles Averted War," which held some surprising confidences of John Foster Dulles, then the Secretary of State, and incidentally coined the word "brinkmanship." It showed us what Dulles' policy was good for—and where it was dangerous.

There is a bit of the missionary in every American and in our zeal to defend the free world we sometimes forget that our right arm, our power to defend, can only be as strong as our heart is strong here at home. Let me call to your minds the more striking magazine articles which have warned us of how vulnerable we are. People will long remember those irrefutable papers which foretold, in the New Yorker, the destruction of our balance of nature by the pesticides, the series on "Silent Spring" which Rachel Carson wrote as she was dying of cancer. People are still talking about the issue of Scientific American which Gerry Piel published last fall depicting so vividly the plight and the hope of our great cities just at the moment when we were setting up a Department of Urban Affairs. Every magazine has been engaged in the struggle for civil rights. I take a partisan pride in the articles on "The South and the Southerner" which Ralph McGill, at my urging, wrote for the Atlantic; I listened when James Baldwin describes "The Fire Next Time"; and I took a vicarious pride in that penetrating symposium on "The White Problem" which John Johnson put together in "Ebony" in August of 1965.

Some of our troubles like that of Watts in Los Angeles are too intricate and too stubborn for any immediate solution and in such cases we keep the pressure steadily applied. This is what Gardner Cowles has done so effectively in Look. That trenchant article, "Three Who Died," was the work of a three-man Look team, and it is the best summation of why those convulsive Negro riots occurred. It is like Mike Cowles' editorial philosophy that you do not let matters stand after one such survey; he believes that the steady and continued exploration of a dangerous subject will provide the cumulative understanding we need. There are others who share Mike's conviction: think of Barbara Ward and of how steadfastly she has appealed for aid other than weaponry for the more vulnerable new nations. Think of James Bryant Conant and how patiently and with what illumination his articles have helped to raise the standards in our public schools.

I said earlier that editors face their responsibility with vigilance and humility. It is a humbling business to try to scan the future. "The future," says Walter Lippmann, "is not predetermined in any book that any man has written. The future is what man will make it; and about the present, in which the future is being prepared, we know something, but not everything, and not nearly enough." In our struggle for truth I think you will agree that we are aided by the most conscientious and responsive body of readers this Nation has ever known. For 43 years I have been studying the reading habits of Americans. I remember how complacent we were in the golden twenties, how little concerned with what was going on in Europe. I remember how self-centered and resentful we were in the depths of the depression. I remember how slow we were to rouse ourselves against Hitler's terrible threat in the late thirties.

History has a way of sending us telegrams. Some of these telegrams are a shock, but we read them and take them to heart; others seem so shocking that we throw them away unheeded. History sent us two portentous telegrams in the 1930's. One was from John Maynard Keynes, and when we had had time to study it and to understand what he meant by deficit financing, we found the answer to unemployment and a defense against the alternating booms and depressions which had wracked this Nation for 150 years. The second telegram which was even more shocking and which we did not heed came to us from Hitler in the form of "Mein Kampf." The first translations of "Mein Kampf" reached us in 1933 but not until years later, not until 1939 did we read the complete text and realize that he really meant what he said.

Editors and readers alike, we have become a very different people since 1946. Our electorate listens to the televised news in the early morning and again before supper. It follows the newspapers closely, not just the sports page, the murders, and the comics. Since 1946 our electorate has shown an insatiable demand for history, for the best thinking on foreign affairs, and for fearless, unsparring explanation of what we must do about civil rights, conservation, the use of drugs, the pollution of air and water, the ratlike corruption that always gnaws at the American fabric. Gentlemen, if there is a more fearless and independent body of readers anywhere in the world, I would not know where to find it.

PROPOSED TREATY ON OUTER SPACE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun carried a cogent editorial this morning in support of President Johnson's proposal of a treaty governing the use of outer space.

The President has rightly seized the initiative by proposing the development of such a treaty now, rather than waiting until after the expected problems arise.

I do not believe that anyone would benefit from proliferating our earth-bound conflicts into outer space. On the other hand, the advantages of cooperation in space exploration are significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Baltimore's Sun's editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE TREATY

President Johnson's appeal for a treaty to prevent space explorations from posing "serious political conflicts" is historic and welcome. He is quite right in saying that now, on the eve of actual ventures to the moon and beyond, is the proper time to establish rules for the conduct of nations in space. We hope he is correct when he says "the time is ripe" for agreement on those rules.

Only the United States and Russia have the capacity for space voyage at the moment, but that will not always be. It is to the advantage of both nations, and to the advantage of all the others who will follow in developing the necessary technology, to outlaw war and narrow national exploitation in space. Much of the modern bloody history of western man stems from the colonial conflict that followed the discovery of the "new world." Those conflicts were not prevented by the two great powers of another day dividing up the spoils between them. The knowledge and possible riches of the planets are tempting, and the best time to agree that those riches belong to all is now, prudentially in advance.

The strategic implications of national control of the moon, the planets and space are still murky—but still ominous. The President rightly asks agreement on the proposition that no weapons of mass destruction be stationed by any nation on celestial bodies. If the major powers could agree to that now, it would be a further step toward stability, as logical and promising as the partial test ban treaty.

For scientists the benefits of space cooperation are obvious. Presently there is much duplication of effort and priorities of a non-scientific nature often are imposed on programs because of political pressures.

For the taxpayer, too, there would be benefits from cooperation. The space program is enormously expensive and will continue to be, but it could be much less expensive if there were no military-political necessity to conduct so much of it on a crash basis.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Dr. W. E. Davis, a Baptist minister from Newport, Ark., is—like many of us—concerned about the rapid proliferation of pornography in America today.

Dr. Davis, founder and director of the Clean Literature Crusade expresses his concern in the following words:

America's moral stream is being polluted daily by the filthy-fingered pornographers who fling their filth and vend their vice from every newsstand in America. Yet, when one dares to protest their moral pollution he is accused of censorship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article entitled "Clean

Literature Crusade Launched by W. E. Davis," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAN LITERATURE CRUSADE LAUNCHED BY
W. E. DAVIS, NEWPORT MINISTER

(By W. E. Davis)

America's moral stream is being polluted daily by the filthy-fingered pornographers who fling their filth and vend their vice from every newsstand in America. Yet, when one dares to protest this moral pollution he is accused of censorship.

Cutting out from society the cancerous growth of pornography is not censorship. Cleaning out the Augean stables of America is not censorship. On the contrary, this is cleansing America, this is protecting the American people and the American home as much as fighting on the battlefields of the Nation for the security of our coastlines.

America has a moral consciousness which needs to be aroused and activated. Sir, at this very moment, an enemy, as potentially pernicious as bombs from Peking, rockets from Moscow, or missiles from Havana, is spreading its poison through the body of our United States. This foe is all the more deadly because it is not even recognized as a threat to the ultimate safety of our country.

Yet the sad and oft-repeated lesson of history teaches us that in vain does a bronze shield defend the heart of a country if the innermost core of the nation's heart is eaten away by the dry rot of immorality.

So it is in our cherished country today, the purveyors of pornography and vendors of vice pose as deadly a threat to our national survival as the most dangerous weapon in the armory of communism.

A house of sand will become a sturdy structure in comparison to the fragility of our civilization if the mortar of moral fiber is withdrawn from between the stone blocks of our National Temple.

Entire civilizations have been built or destroyed by the effects of books. The reading of a good, clean book, such as the Bible, will have a beneficial effect upon society. At the same time, the reading of a bad, dirty book, such as "Mein Kampf," will have a baneful effect upon society.

Yes, we as Americans, are living in a time of tremendous moral crisis. This moral crisis is evident in many phases of American life, but perhaps there is no areas wherein it is better illustrated than in the field of literature.

For example, the latrine literature advanced by the National Council of Churches advocating a "new morality"—found wide acceptance in the religious world. The pursuit of this pornographic propaganda has produced the theological theory—"God is dead."

Likewise, in our schools and colleges, boys and girls have drunk the drippings from depraved minds until today demonstrations desecrate the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

Literature, it seems to me, has an obligation to uplift, not to degrade. This is especially true of the material presented to young minds in their formative stages. In the minds of the generation which will one day lead our Nation, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, if you please, to inculcate an appreciation for the best our society has to offer, not a morbid interest in its more sordid aspects.

To a great extent, a literate nation is what it reads. Our reading material directs our thoughts. Our thoughts, in turn, direct our actions. Our actions congeal to form our habits. Our habits mold our very characters.

Arnold Toynbee is reported to have said, that of the 21 civilizations which have arisen and vanished, 19 fell from internal decay.

So, my interest, sir, is not censorship, just a concern about the moral foundation of

America. It is a sad commentary upon the lofty profession of journalism when any individual will editorially erode the moral foundations of our "Great Society."

May I conclude by saying—"Extremism in the defense of decency is no vice. Moderation in respect to morality is no virtue."

THREAT TO PROJECT MOHOLE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the immediate and unfavorable reaction which resulted from the action of the House Appropriations Committee last week in disapproving funds for Project Mohole. Specifically, I refer to two editorials from responsible newspapers expressing concern over the future of the project. One editorial appeared in the Honolulu advertiser last Saturday; the other in the Washington Post this morning. Both make a strong case for continuing this scientific project as a matter of national interest.

As one who has long supported Project Mohole, I take the view that the project should be continued—that its potential for providing mankind with new and needed scientific information about the earth's structure outweighs the costs involved.

I quote from the Honolulu Advertiser's editorial:

It is possible to sympathize with the Representatives in their enormous task of trying to squeeze waste out of a \$14 billion money bill for 23 Federal agencies. We wish them luck so long as the cutting and pruning are judiciously exercised and those projects tossed on the scrap heap are truly expendable. That is good Government.

But we are budgeting billions for space exploration. It is deemed in the national interest to do so and to land a man on the moon by 1970. It makes no sense, therefore, to eliminate the one project afoot that may tell us what matter we will find out there and how to cope with it.

A kill in funds now would kill the entire program—"As if we had never started," said Dr. George P. Woollard, head of the Institute of Geophysics here at the university and spearhead of the Mohole project—\$30 million would be down the drain.

It seems at this moment when the spending of Federal funds is being examined so critically, we may find that we cannot afford not to go ahead with Mohole.

If what the scientists say is true about its value to the space program, we shall have to come back to it eventually—behind the Russians?—at a time when the cost could be billions, not millions.

I commend the Honolulu Advertiser for stating the case for restoring funds for Project Mohole so clearly and cogently.

The Washington Post editorial also advances convincing arguments against abandoning the project. I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1966]

PROJECT MOHOLE STYMIED

Project Mohole, an ambitious but uncertain scientific attempt to pierce the earth's crust, has become a victim of the war-spurred congressional economy drive. The House Appropriations Committee has denied it funds for fiscal 1967. Even though there is reason for concern about Mohole on both cost and management counts, a complete

cutoff of money risks the loss of the funds already invested.

The ambitious plan to drill through the earth's crust 30,000 feet under the Pacific Ocean off Hawaii has caught the imagination of world scientists. It is exciting to speculate about what might be learned from samplings taken so deep in the earth. Moreover, if the huge unanchored drilling platform planned for Mohole actually works and if the drilling process itself works, they may be of great assistance to the oil industry as its offshore exploration moves to deeper waters.

But there are three reasons for doubt about Mohole. First, the prospective cost has risen sharply. Estimates now are about \$80 million and some authorities foresee a total of as much as \$130 million—substantially more than envisaged even last September when the administration's scientific advisers gave their final approval. Second, there is a feeling within Congress that the project has been mismanaged by the National Science Foundation, which was not originally constituted as an operational agency. Third, Mohole's principal champion, Representative ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, died in February, and there seemingly is no one else with the same interest in pushing appropriations for it. Thus critics and skeptics have an open field.

Yet it would be a pity to abandon this effort to learn more about the environment of the planet on which we live—especially when there is still so much attention to the mysteries of outer space. Complete withdrawal from the Mohole project would mean writing off an investment of some \$50 million. Perhaps the requested new appropriation of \$19.6 million is excessive; but cannot enough be provided to keep the project on a standby basis so that it may be resumed at a more favorable time? Surely the scientific community and the White House ought to urge reinstatement of enough funds to keep Project Mohole cranking in low gear.

COMMUTER TRAIN CUTBACK IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I make no comment on the legal aspects of the New Jersey Public Utility Commission's decision in the Erie-Lackawanna case. But its practical effect is clear. Railroad commuter service in our metropolitan New Jersey-New York region is about to be reduced still further.

By now everyone should know that you cannot help ailing railroads by stopping off a few—or many—trains. Invariably the effect is to accelerate the downhill slide by driving the ever-shrinking band of patrons to other, more convenient, more dependable means of transportation.

Commuter passenger service will survive only if the commuter can be attracted back to the trains. But to do this will require providing frequent, reliable, on-time, comfortable trains and safe, clean, attractive terminals.

This, in turn, will require, as I long have urged, the development of a unified, balanced transportation system to serve the whole region, not just a few parts of it. And it now seems clear that we can no longer avoid the conclusion that such a coordinated system can be provided only by a competent, bistate or tristate agency.

A LESSON IN COURAGE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to pick up a paper and

read a sports column like the one written by Merrell Whittlesey in the Thursday, April 21 edition of the Evening Star.

Under the heading, "Orioles' Bat Boy Gives Lesson in Courage," Merrell Whittlesey has written the story of Jay Mazzone, 12-year-old son of a Maryland State trooper who is bat boy for the visiting clubs at Memorial Stadium in Baltimore.

When he was only 2, Jay was nearly burned to death. Now he has hooks for hands, and skin has been grafted over much of his body. These handicaps do not get in his way, however, and he asks no favors. He performs his duties as bat boy with energy and efficiency, and has gained the admiration of all visiting players.

Merrell Whittlesey is to be commended for bringing the story of Jay Mazzone to the public's attention as an example of great courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 21, 1966]

ORIOLES' BAT BOY GIVES LESSON IN COURAGE
(By Merrell Whittlesey)

Visiting ballplayers in Baltimore's Memorial Stadium have a gentle, sober reminder this season that base hits, errors, and earned runs are not the most important things in life.

The bat boy for the visiting clubs is Jay Mazzone, 12-year-old son of a Maryland State trooper who was burned close to death when he was 2½ years old. Jay has hooks for hands—his were burned off above the wrists in a fire in his back yard—and has skin grafted over much of his body.

But this spry youngster carries his cross with distinction. The ball players eye him with sympathetic interest when they first spot him, but both Yankees and Senators took him to their hearts. They flip his cap, pat him on the back, and watch him with admiration.

Jay is not looking for sympathy. He cares for the bats with the hooks he uses for hands in a professional manner. He doesn't need any reminders. Jay is on top of every play, in batting practice and during the ball game.

He takes off his school clothes and dons his baseball uniform, with the No. 1 on the back, without any help. For the first two games of the Yankee series last week, his dad was there to tie his shoes. But his father was on duty during the third game and Bobby Richardson, the Yankee second baseman, observed the youngster tying his shoes with the hooks and offered to help.

But Jay said no thank you, sir, and tied them himself. But he said last night before the Senators' game that Mr. Richardson and Bobby Murcer, the young Yankee shortstop, were extra nice to him, and he remembered them and Mr. Crosetti, the coach.

Frank gave Jay a half-dozen new balls and a ball autographed with all the Yankee names. The youngster was very appreciative.

The players appear reluctant to ask Jay about his accident, but he is not backward to those who overcome their hesitance.

He and his brother were playing in the backyard of their home in Pleasantville, N.J., where their father at the time was a city policeman. They were near a trash pile which had kerosene cans on it, played with the can, and the kerosene spilled over Jay's snowsuit.

Then he was too close to the fire. A spark ignited the suit and he went up in flames.

For a month it was touch and go as to whether he would live. Skin was grafted from the few unburned parts of his body, his dad gave skin from his legs, back and stomach, and Jay pulled through.

Jay's family moved to Baltimore 4 years ago when his father was named to the Maryland State Police force and last year a friend of his father wrote to the Orioles and Jay was invited to try out for bat boy. He served one series for the Tigers and one for the Orioles. This year he was told the visiting clubs were his own.

Jay is a sixth grade student at Sinclair Lane school, where he asks no favors.

He plays on an organized football team and uses foam rubber padding for hands. He is a right fielder on a baseball team and uses a special glove with a hook apparatus. He swims, plays table tennis and knows how to use a rifle.

In the basketball season he is a ball boy for the Baltimore Bullets.

Jay said that Coach George Susce and Bobby Saverine were particularly attentive to him among the Senators, but all of the players seemed nice, although he had them on two losing nights.

"He hustles every minute," Gil Hodges said last night, with admiration. "Look at the bats, every one in place. If there is a loose ball, he grabs it in his hook and tosses it to somebody."

"I was watching him during our first game and in an idle moment he grabbed a bat and was pounding on a resin bag, handling the bat just as though he had hands."

Jay has a locker in a corner of the visiting clubhouse. He changes clothes without help. Earlier he brought a candy bar from the clubhouse to the bench, peeled off the paper with his hooks, and held it in the cold steel frames as he ate it.

The ballplayers watch him quietly and his courage makes baseball seem awfully unimportant.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS RETIREMENT AND ANNUITY FUND

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate Calendar No. 1101, H.R. 11439.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Effective", to strike out "the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment" and insert "December 1, 1965,"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "such effective date" and insert "December 30, 1965,"; in line 9, after the word "month", to strike out "latest published on the date of enactment of this amendment," and insert "of July 1965"; and on page 5, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. This Act shall take effect December 1, 1965.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: SYMBOL AND SUBSTANCE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, President Johnson's visit to Mexico last month demonstrated once again the strong bonds between the United States and Latin America, the enormous good will and affection for the United States that can be found to the south.

It also demonstrated that even in the midst of crisis in Vietnam and difficulties in Europe, the President of the United States does not forget that to the south are lands of 230 million people, with whose future we are and must be intimately concerned.

And most important, the President used this occasion to remind all the people of the Americas—North and South—that the United States stands unequivocally for democracy and for social justice; that—

We will not be deterred by those who tenaciously or selfishly cling to special privileges from the past, and and we will not be deterred by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism;

that the alliance is nothing less than a "social revolution."

These are welcome words, beyond question a commitment to the ideals of the Alliance which must help to still the doubts of any, in Latin America and the United States, who question the depth and duration of those ideals.

What the President has done, however, is no signal for others of us, in the government and elsewhere, to relax our own efforts. Rather, it is a challenge to all of us to move forward, beyond the principles he has so clearly enunciated; to help turn his words into action; to apply these principles to the complex and difficult problems that are the face of reality in Latin America.

For the greatest danger confronting the Alliance for Progress is that its great exhortations to economic progress, to social justice and democracy, may become, in the press of day-to-day demands, no more than words. The charter is no precious talisman, to be taken from its case and exhibited periodically; it must be used. Its ideals must pervade every aspect of our policy. It must govern not only the necessarily infrequent acts of Presidents—but the daily actions of every member and part of the U.S. Government with responsibility in Latin America.

It is to the detailed working out of the President's policy—the great efforts and hard choices ahead—that I address myself today; to discuss some of the areas in which we must concentrate our atten-

tion, the areas on which the President touched so eloquently in Mexico City.

But before discussing specific problems, there is one element of our policy that must be clear—one constant thread running through all our days:

That we associate ourselves with the aspirations of the Latin American people for a better life—for justice between men and nations—for the dignity of freedom and self-sufficiency. These demands are in part material; above all, they are demands of the spirit.

But we must realize that the demands of the spirit—the demands for justice and a sense of participation in the life of one's country—are the essential precondition to material progress. The dispossessed and the landless will not strive and sacrifice to improve land they do not own, in whose proceeds they do not share. Parents will not sacrifice to insure education for their children, the children themselves will not study, if the schools to which they go end in the third grade, and if they are considered unfit for admission to higher grades. Individual entrepreneurs will not flourish in a closed society, a society which reserves all wealth and power and privilege for the same classes, the same families, which have held that wealth and power for the last 300 years.

We will understand the demands of justice—and help to meet them—only by a renewed consciousness and dedication to our own heritage, to the dreams of liberty and justice which have sustained this Nation since our birth in revolution less than two centuries ago.

Without this spirit, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, all our efforts will be useless.

With this spirit, no matter what the obstacles, any material poverty can be overcome.

I. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS THE CHARTER

Five years ago this spring, President Kennedy called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress, "a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health, and schools—*trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela*. And he proposed "a vast new 10-year plan for the Americas—a plan to transform the 1960's into a historic decade for democratic progress."

That proposal was accepted by all the Latin American nations—except Cuba. In August of 1961, at Punta del Este in Uruguay, 20 nations signed the charter of an Alliance established on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy the common aspirations of man. The charter pledged efforts at development—setting a target of at least 2.5 percent per year growth in income per person. But it was far more than a promise of economic development. In addition it pledged—

A more equitable distribution of national incomes, raising more rapidly the income and standard of living of the needier sectors of the population;

Diversification of national economic structures, to reduce dependence on a limited number of primary products;

Acceleration of industrialization, particularly of capital goods, to increase productivity; storage, transport, and marketing;

Comprehensive agrarian reform, with a view to replacing latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure so that, with credit, technical assistance, and improved marketing, the land will become for the man who works it the basis of his economic stability, the foundation of his increasing welfare, and the guarantee of his freedom and dignity;

The elimination of illiteracy and a sixth grade education for all school-age children;

Improved health, including new water supply and sewage services for 70 percent of the urban and 50 percent of the rural population;

Expanded housing and public services for urban and rural population centers;

Stable price levels, but always bearing in mind the necessity of maintaining an adequate rate of economic growth; and

Cooperative programs designed to prevent the harmful effects of excessive fluctuations in foreign exchange earnings derived from exports.

And the United States pledged at least a billion dollars a year of assistance of all kinds, to help make these changes possible.

THE ROOTS

This Alliance for Progress was a response to the demands of the 1960's; its roots run deeper and further in time. In the past, the United States had acted as "protector" of hemispheric stability—intervening militarily in Latin American nations 21 times just in the period 1898 to 1924. And too often our great strength was used, not to advance the freedom and aspirations of the Latin American people, but in the name of stability, to protect our short-range economic interests.

Military intervention ended with the Good Neighbor policy; the last marines left the Caribbean in the 1930's, and relations improved through inter-American cooperation in World War II.

But in the years following World War II our attention, energies, and resources were largely concentrated on the great and urgent task of rebuilding Europe and working for the containment of, and then a just and stable peace with, Soviet power. Latin America was neglected and ignored. In the 15 years after the war, we provided \$30 billion to Europe; \$15 billion to Asia; but only \$2.5 billion to our own hemisphere, to help the declining economies of an entire underdeveloped continent. We were content to accept, and even support, whatever governments were in power, asking only that they did not disturb the surface calm of the hemisphere. We gave medals to dictators; praised backward regimes; and became steadily identified with institutions and men who held their lands in poverty and fear.

In the late 1950's the failures of this policy, or lack of policy, erupted into anti-Americanism and the growth of communism. Our Vice President was

mobbed and stoned in Caracas. Communist revolution—caused less by Castro and his band in the Sierra Maestra, than by the bloody and corrupt tyranny of Batista which we supported to the moment of its collapse—took power in Cuba; and his defiance of the United States received the secret admiration of many who hated communism, but rejoiced to see the discomfort of the huge and seemingly callous giant to the north.

Thus were we awakened from what Roberto Campos called the perilous lull. Latin American leaders seized the opportunity to press for change; President Kubitschek proposed a great Operation Pan America; revolutionary statesmen like Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela and Eduardo Frei in Chile received new strength in their own countries, and new recognition from the United States. In August of 1958 we had agreed to the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank and, in the Act of Bogotá, committed ourselves to take some tentative steps toward social reform. Now, in 1960, Congress authorized \$500 million for a Social Progress Trust Fund to be administered by the new Bank.

And the stage was set for the great adventure—the Alliance for Progress—an Alliance whose goal was nothing less than to lift an entire continent into the modern age; receiving not only the blessings of its technology and the abundance of its economy; but above all, seeking human dignity and personal freedom, living in the ideal that all men deserve an equal chance to share in the blessings of this world.

This was the difference between the Alliance and all our previous relationships with Latin America. President Kennedy saw that what was important was not the statistics of economic development, but the human and spiritual reality behind them. It would matter little that a nation's economy grew by some millions of dollars, if those dollars were not used to improve the lot of the dispossessed and hungry poor. No material improvement would bring dignity to the lives of men unless other men treated them with the respect and dignity that are the due of citizens in a just and democratic state. And there could be no lasting peace in the Americas unless relations between all the American nations were founded in deep and genuine respect, for the hopes and rights and future of the people in every part of the hemisphere.

As President Kennedy saw, the Alliance was not and could not be a program of U.S. assistance, but a cooperative effort among all the nations of the Americas. It embraced not simply economic progress, but social justice, political freedom, and democratic government. It was an attack not just on poverty, but on the oppression and exploitation of man by man which had too long been the ruling pattern in the hemisphere.

This was a pledge of revolutionary change, for Latin America as well as for the United States. But the need for change was not universally accepted, either in Latin America, or in the United States; nor, despite President Johnson's efforts, is it universally accepted today.

There are still those who believe that stability can be maintained, and communism defeated, by force of arms; that those who have waited three centuries for justice can wait another so that old privileges may be preserved; that the economic machinery of the 20th century can be developed and managed by social structures which were outmoded in the 18th.

But there can be no preservation of the status quo in Latin America. The central question before us is not whether we can prevent change, but, as President Kennedy put it, whether "man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by free men, working within a framework of democratic institutions."

To appreciate the force of that question, and the meaning of the choices ahead, it is first necessary to look at what is in Latin America; at its geography and resources, the legacy of the past and the stirring currents of the future.

II. BACKGROUND FOR CHANGE

I returned from Latin America with impressions and emotions as varied as the peoples and places of that vast continent.

For it is varied; each nation has its own institutions, its own history, its own dream of the future. Income standards, education, numbers and composition of population, the quality of life and living—all vary greatly within and between nations.

Still they share many characteristics in common. And foremost among these is the feeling of admiration, respect, and deep affection which their people arouse in the visitor. In the words of the Mexican economist Victor Urquidí:

These people have endured three centuries of colonial rule, a hundred years of civil war, invasion and various forms of organized bloodshed, a good deal of exploitation by domestic landowners and foreign investors, the effects of the world economic depression of the thirties, and, more recently, the hot and cold wars of the great world powers—and, throughout it all, an almost intolerable amount of corruption and repression.

Even today, they cling to life with a precarious hold; it is as if they were not of the land, but only on it. Life is short, the works of man seem impermanent; it is for some as if Pizarro came only an instant before. Governments sometimes seem to come and go almost at random, and the dynamics of change may seem entirely arbitrary: a civilian government may infringe on army privileges; or the navy may come into conflict with the army, or two branches of the army with each other; or a popularly elected President may go mad, or the army remove another for alcoholism.

Political labels, to the eye of a North American, are confusing, and make uninformed judgments dangerous. Latin Americans themselves are sometimes bedeviled by the overlap and contradictions between parties or factions. There is a "right" of the past, of the old landed oligarchy, and a "right" of the present, of business and commerce. There are popular forces of reaction, for example Peronism; there are popular forces of

democratic progress; and there are popular forces of Marxist socialism or communism.

The divisions and antagonisms may be as great between the two kinds of right-wing forces as they are between left and right. There are similar antagonisms between the popular forces; and the former dictators Odría in Peru and Perón in Argentina got the votes of the poor slum dwellers through government programs for their benefit, though neither one was either democratic or progressive, and each repressed even mildly Socialist parties of the left. And many political factions, in this many-faceted politics, have their own military allies—too often ready to seek by force a predominance not conferred by the electorate.

Inflation—the cruelest of taxes on the tenant farmer and the unorganized worker—is in some countries endemic, and the savings of millions may be almost wiped out in a year. Yet even such harrowing uncertainty does not touch millions of Latin Americans who live entirely outside the money economy.

HAZARDS OF GEOGRAPHY

The continent has not been physically conquered. The distances between places are immense: 745 miles from Guayaquil in Ecuador to Lima, Peru; then 1,600 miles more down the west coast to Santiago; to Buenos Aires another 706 miles; to Rio de Janeiro, 1,200 more; and from there to Caracas another 2,810.

And between many of these places lies almost nothing—nothing but mountains and deserts and vast plains or jungles. Chile is 2,630 miles long; just over 8 million people live there, nearly 3 million in and around the single city of Santiago. It is as if the population of New York City were strung out from Goose Bay, in Labrador, to Key West, with the Rocky Mountains less than 100 miles from the Atlantic. Capital cities, which may hold one-third or even one-half of their countries' populations, often sit like islands in midocean, cut off by a hostile Nature from contact with each other or with the world outside.

This is true between countries. Peru and Chile are neighbors; they are separated by a great desert on which no men live. Between Chile and Argentina rises the great cordillera of the Andes; between the cities of Brazil and those of Venezuela or Peru are the unexplored jungles of the Amazon. But isolation and insularity are the rule even within nations. Peru, for example, is a sea-coast nation, with an advancing export economy based on marine products. It is also a mountain nation, a place of scattered inaccessible villages where peasants have never heard of the United States—where even the word "Peru" has no meaning. And it is a nation of Amazon jungle beyond the mountains, a jungle which is no closer to the thoughts of Lima than to the thoughts of Washington or Indianapolis.

As Walter Lippmann has incisively pointed out, this geography has severely limited progress in the past, and still does today. Economic integration is handicapped because it is cheaper to ship goods from Europe than across the

Andes. The Indians of the altiplano, the high plain of Peru, live almost as if the conquistadores had never left, or even come, in part because from their village it may take weeks of lonely journey to reach the capital, Lima. Millions of peasants are apathetic because their miserable poverty is the only way of life they have ever seen. The aimlessness of much of Latin American politics must result from the severe limits the land places on the possibilities of action upon which a meaningful political life must focus. And the extent to which Latin American governing classes have lacked concern for the welfare of their people probably results in part from the fact that people and places of misery have seldom seemed like parts of the same country in which the more fortunate lived.

THE LEGACY OF THE PAST

The people of Latin America struggle with more than the hazards of geography. They live also with the inheritance of history—as Teodoro Moscoso has written, a history of conquerors,

who sought above all the gold and the many other riches of the new world. * * * They established in their new world, * * * the authoritarian rule of the elite which was the mode of government at home. * * * Indians in the Western countries and Negroes on the shores of the Caribbean and the Atlantic were serving as workhorses on plantations and rocky farms while the landlords enjoyed the finer things in life. * * * They produced bananas, sugar, wheat, meat, metals, and other food and raw materials that industrializing nations in Europe and North America were eager to buy. In short, economically they were very much like the African and Asian possessions of the European powers.

There are many legacies of this colonial period. One is the basic economy of much of Latin America—dependence on single commodity exports, relative lack of industry, absence of a mass market, prevalence of government monopolies. A new group of entrepreneurs, often the most progressive and liberal members of their communities, and a similar group of public servants, typified by Raul Prebisch of Argentina and UNCTAD, Hector Hurtado of Venezuela, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria of Colombia and the CIAP, Roberto Campos of Brazil, and many others, have worked to reform this system; its prevalence in spite of their efforts attests to the strength of the past.

But the past lives, more importantly, throughout the social structure: in education systems designed for a social elite; in concentrated land ownership; in constitutions which in some areas may effectively disenfranchise 80 percent of the electorate; in a feudal disdain for productive investment and for the hard work that is the lot of the majority.

POVERTY

The final legacy of this pattern of development is poverty and degradation and want, the statistics of which have become almost a litany.

Income per person is often less than \$100 yearly; the average for all of Brazil is at most \$300 and may well be less; 60 percent of the people of El Salvador have incomes of less than \$55 a year.

Ignorance is standard in nearly all the countries; in Colombia, for example, only 60 percent of all children enter the first grade—and 90 percent of these have dropped out by the fourth grade. Fifty percent of all Latin Americans are illiterate.

Disease and malnutrition are almost everywhere; half of all the people buried in Latin America never reached their fourth year.

To travel in Latin America, to see the terrible reality of human misery, is to feel these statistics with stunning force.

In Recife, there are people who live in shacks by the water in which they dump their refuse and garbage; the crabs which feed on that garbage are the staple of their diet.

In fields nearby, men cut cane in the broiling sun from dawn to dusk, 6 days a week—and take home \$1.50 for their week's labor; children under 16 make half as much; the minimum wage of 60 cents a day is not enforced. In some of their villages, and in others which we visited, 7 out of 10 children die before their first birthday—and there are primary schools for only one-quarter of those who do survive. In other villages nearby, a new factory has contaminated the water supply—and the mortality rate for children and adults is catastrophic.

In Peru, outside Cuzco, we met men working their landlord's fields for 45 cents a day, a good wage in an area where others must work 3 days with no pay beyond the right to cultivate a small mountainside plot for themselves. They had never heard of President Kennedy or President Johnson; they had never heard of the United States; they did not know the name of the President of Peru; and they spoke no Spanish, only the Quechua tongue of their Indian ancestors. In one village, I was introduced as the President of Peru—because, according to our Peace Corps guides, the mayor said he had dreamed, shortly before, that the President of Peru was coming to his village.

And everywhere, in and around every major city, were the slums—incredible masses of tin or tarpaper or mud huts, one room to each, with what seemed like dozens of children coming out of every doorway. Called *barriadas* in Lima, *poblaciones callampas* in Santiago, *villas miserias* in Buenos Aires, *favelas* in Rio de Janeiro, and *ranchitos* in Caracas, all are the same—vast numbers of peasants who have come to the cities in search of a better life, but find no work, no schools, no housing, no sanitary facilities, no doctors—and all too little hope.

And in Peru, Brazil, and in other countries of Latin America are the Indians not only cut off from the outside world but frequently their own political structures, desperately crying out for the help that will bring them into the 20th century.

These are some of the obstacles which confront the people of Latin America. Yet they have endured. They have sustained a faith in democracy and the value of the individual. They have, as the world saw last month in Mexico, kept a great fund of friendship and admiration for the people of the United States. They have produced some of the finest

artists and poets of our time. And they have preserved a spirit of spontaneous gaiety and humor, even in the midst of adversity, that is a lesson to all of us elsewhere in the world.

But we should not be surprised. For greatness is also part of the legacy of Latin America.

It is a legacy of civilizations—Mayan and Aztec and Inca—built before the white man came, whose buildings and treasures still thrill the eye.

It is a legacy of the proud and audacious men who came to conquer a continent—not with great armies, but with bands of a few hundred.

It is a legacy of men like Fra Bartolomeo de las Casas, who began a crusade for the welfare of the Indians in the 16th Century.

It is the legacy of Hidalgo and O'Higgins and San Martin and Bolivar—the liberators who caught the fire of our own revolution and sought liberty and equality for all men in the Western Hemisphere.

NEW WINDS BLOWING

These legacies, this spirit, are alive today, perhaps more than ever before. Everywhere we traveled, the ideals of independence and freedom and justice are a moving, active force. Everywhere, it is this legacy which is thrusting forward, the future seen plainly on the faces of the people.

Latin America is poor. But Venezuela's gross income is already on a par with Southern European levels of a few years ago, and is rising every year.

Latin America is short of trained people. But in Brazil and Chile and Peru, the "new men," economists and engineers and administrators, are stretching their considerable talents in the cause of progress.

Latin American politics have too often been restricted to upper class involvement. But in Chile and Venezuela and Peru, we saw democratic parties speaking for the majority of the people and acting in response to their interests; and in every country men and parties are dedicated to new progress—and to ancient ideals of justice.

For Latin America is on the move. Every legacy of the past, every state of rest, is under assault by the forces of change.

We saw change in the barrios of Caracas, where Peace Corps-type projects of community organizations and self-help are being carried on by an *Accion* force made up primarily of Venezuelans.

We saw change in the countryside of Chile, where agricultural workers are organizing unions to better their wages and working conditions, and ultimately to secure land for themselves.

We saw change in Sao Paulo, where new industries and new prosperity have built a boom city as contemporary as anything in the United States.

We saw change in remote villages in Peru, where students are working with poor peasants to build schools and housing and public facilities.

And we heard of change everywhere—from Bolivia, where 400,000 people have come down off the high plain, following

a new road into the jungle to clear and cultivate new lands; from Minas Gerais in Brazil, where other thousands are following the new roads to Brasilia; from the mouth of the Orinoco in Venezuela, where a new Pittsburgh is rising.

This is the progress that is beginning in Latin America; but still for most Latin Americans there has been little progress, little fulfillment. The old dreams of freedom and justice, independence and democracy, have received a new form and new life in the charter of the Alliance; but the obstacles to progress have not been overcome.

To achieve the ideals of the Alliance, the aims which President Johnson expressed so well last month, there must be, as he said, a social revolution.

For there cannot be steady jobs and housing and economic security; there cannot be schools for all the children; and there can be no democracy, or justice, or individual dignity without revolutionary changes in the economic, social, and political systems of every Latin American nation.

And these changes the people of Latin America are determined to have. The coal miners in Concepción, laboring 5 miles under the sea for \$1.50 a day—the mothers in Andean villages where schoolteachers tell the children that their parents' tongue is the speech of animals—the cancutters and laborers watching their children die—the priests who see the teachings of their church violated by the lords of the land—these people are the engines of change in Latin America.

These people will not accept this kind of existence for the next generation. We would not; they will not. There will be changes.

So a revolution is coming—a revolution which will be peaceful if we are wise enough; compassionate if we care enough; successful if we are fortunate enough—but a revolution which is coming whether we will it or not. We can affect its character; we cannot alter its inevitability.

But to say this is only the beginning; the question is now how the revolution is to be made and guided.

At the heart of the revolution, underlying all hope for economic progress and social justice, are two great and resistant problems—education and land reform. Both education and land reform are needed for economic growth. No amount of capital, no purely economic measures, can bring progress unless each nation has the trained and skilled people to do the work of modernization and change. Nor can any industrial economy be built on a failing, inadequate and obsolete system of agricultural production.

But these are far more than economic measures. No matter how rich or powerful a nation may grow, children condemned to ignorance, families enslaved to land they cannot hope to own, are denied the dignity—the fulfillment of talent and hope—which is the purpose of economic progress. Progress without justice is false progress—and a false hope. Thus education and land reform must be at the heart of our concern for change in Latin America; and among

the highest priorities of Latin American Governments themselves.

III. LAND REFORM THE NEED

Unproductive agriculture is probably the major factor in Latin American poverty. As a continent, Latin America does not feed itself. Sorely needed foreign exchange is spent to import food—\$140 million for 8 million Chileans alone. Insufficient nutrition saps the strength and productivity of many of the hemisphere's workers.

Over half the continent is engaged primarily in farming (in contrast to the United States where farmers are less than one-fifteenth of the labor force). Much of the labor of the subsistence farmers of Latin America is relatively wasteful; often they cannot feed themselves decently, let alone produce surpluses. By contrast, agriculture has provided the greater part of increases in our own productivity and wealth; agricultural productivity has risen 6 percent yearly, as against about 2 to 3 percent in manufacturing.

The lack of productive employment on the land reverberates throughout Latin America. Children drop out of school because of their poverty. Manufacturing languishes because there is no mass market. The cities receive great new influxes of people who apparently feel that poverty in the city is at any rate more exciting than poverty in the countryside.

In short, no solution to Latin problems is possible without great progress in agriculture.

This was recognized by the charter of the Alliance, which called for comprehensive agrarian reform; by President Kennedy, who placed it at the head of his efforts for the Alliance; and again by President Johnson in Mexico City. And it is recognized throughout the nations of Latin America, where land reform is in the forefront of public attention.

But still the Inter-American Bank tells us that the fundamental pattern of the agrarian structure has not changed in the past few years; food output per person is just where it was 5 years ago.

Toward this vital goal of the Alliance, we must make greater progress.

LAND REFORM: THE ELEMENTS OF A PROGRAM

True land reform requires much effort, of many different kinds.

First, land must be redistributed. Many Latin American farmers are really laborers who own no land at all; they have neither the incentive nor the means to increase production. Of those who do own land, the great majority farm less than 10 acres, which are likely to be of poor quality. Throughout Latin America, it is estimated that more than 70 percent of the landowners control less than 4 percent of the land. Ninety percent of all land is controlled by less than 10 percent of the landholders; and there are nations in which less than 1 percent of all landholders control nearly 70 percent of the land.

Thus, one family in Peru owned over 300,000 hectares, or 741,000 acres—an

area nearly as great as the State of Rhode Island.

The smallest plots, the dwarf holdings, can build up no capital—for fertilizer, for machinery, for better seeds; their poor and unschooled owners are largely ignorant of better farming methods. But neither have the great latifundia often been more productive per acre than the smaller holdings. Most owners are absent. Their workers are uneducated and underpaid, with little incentive. The very size of the estates has allowed their owners to become wealthy without substantial capital investment to increase productivity. In Peru, for example, haciendas of over 2,500 hectares are one-tenth of 1 percent of all farms, and hold 60 percent of all the acreage; yet they cultivate less than 5 percent of their land—as against smaller farms which cultivate half or two-thirds of their area.

For these reasons the charter of the Alliance called for the replacement of latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure; it recognized that redistribution of land, to create adequate family-size farms and cooperatives, must be the basis of a productive and efficient agriculture.

It was recognized also that redistribution of land is essential for the dignity and freedom of the man who lives on it. Like the framers of our own Constitution, the framers of the Alliance believed that an independent, propertied yeomanry would be the surest foundation of democracy and political stability. And surely we in the United States—a nation built on private property—will understand the importance of assuring the widest possible opportunity for the ownership of private property in other nations.

Land redistribution is a complex and difficult task. Efficient use of land must be rewarded and inefficient use penalized; complicated formulae may have to be devised to take account of such factors as whether land is irrigated. The method of compensation for land which is taken for redistribution will usually present serious difficulties. And the lack of a basic system of recording land titles, or even determining who actually owns land, can delay distribution for years.

Moreover, redistribution may well result, in the short run, in lowered agricultural productivity, and lowered food shipments to the cities—creating additional hardships for city dwellers and additional obstacles, such as inflation, to economic development. Further, many of the farmers of the hemisphere are unprepared for independent ownership; and it would be tragic if we were now to repeat the history of land reform in Mexico, where much land distributed in the 1920's was sold off to large holders within 20 years.

Yet for all the problems, all the difficulties, land must be redistributed. Over the long run, it is an essential step toward a productive agriculture. But it is much more. Land reform is the essence of human dignity and democracy in Latin America. To give land to the man who works it is to give him, for the first time, a degree of security—something more than subsistence living—a place to

stand for his rights as a citizen, a share and a stake in the society around him. As our own Daniel Webster said in 1820:

The freest government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable, if the tendency of the laws was to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands, and to render the great mass of the population dependent and penniless. * * * Universal suffrage, for example, could not long exist in a community where there was great inequality of property.

The question then becomes, what else we must do to make redistribution work. What are the additional needs of an agrarian reform program?

Fences, seed, fertilizer, machinery, livestock—these are as important to farm output as the land itself. But Latin American smallholders have neither these things nor, as a rule, access to agricultural credit with which to buy them. Farmers must be instructed in the use of their land and tools; but there are no land-grant colleges, no extension agents or advisers, to help the new farmer to make his land more productive.

And when he produces more, the farmer will have to send it to market. But agricultural marketing is also in a rudimentary state; only the relatively few cash-crop plantations have convenient and direct access to markets, and there is much to be done by way of standardizing grades and prices and quality, and creating a structure of middlemen between farmers and consumers which can assure a fair price to the farmer, not taking all the profit for themselves; all these are essential to a modern agricultural market.

To make a real land reform—to build an agricultural system which will feed these nations and support their farmers—will therefore require the creation of a new institutional structure. Agricultural credit, training for farmers, extension services, new networks for transportation and distribution—all these are difficult to build; but all must be created.

Next, the geography of Latin America must be overcome. For there is simply not enough acreage under cultivation. In Peru, for example, there is under cultivation about one-half of an acre per person. President Belaunde has set an average of three-quarters of an acre per person as a target. But even this is far from the U.S. average of over 2 acres per person under cultivation. Given the low productivity of land in Latin America, Peru would need to more than quadruple its present acreage under cultivation in order to match our food output per person.

Increases of anywhere near this magnitude will require a great colonization effort east of the Andean Mountains—in that part of Peru, three-fifths of its territory, which is part of the Amazon Basin. And this in turn will require efforts of many different kinds. Roads are the first priority; but schools and housing and other facilities will also have to be built for any new settlers. More basically, we do not yet know how to raise many crops in the Amazon Basin; temperature and rainfall levels have so far prevented systematic colonization. Thus major efforts at research in tropi-

cal agriculture are necessary; and even after new techniques are developed, it will be necessary to instruct tens of thousands of farmers in their use.

In summary, then, "land reform" must be far more than an attractive slogan. Real improvement in Latin American agriculture, and in the lives of those who till the soil, requires decades of effort—economic, educational, and social.

It requires a commitment and it requires action—and that action must come now.

LAND REFORM: POLITICAL

But these efforts are only part of what is required. Land reform requires a great political effort; for it is, at the root, a political question: of the will and determination to reform the basic social and political system of a nation.

Land is the principal form of wealth in Latin America; its possessors, while by no means all-powerful, still are highly influential everywhere, and naturally resistant to reform. Large-scale land redistribution necessarily implies major changes in the internal political balance of many Latin American countries—away from oligarchy and privilege, toward more popular government.

Improvements in the educational system, also vital to comprehensive land reform, would also work great changes in the political balance. Representation of any area in the Brazilian Congress, for example, is based on total population. But illiterates are ineligible to vote; and in some areas, dominated by large landowners, up to 80 percent of the people are illiterate. This illiteracy gives to the established groups in these areas great leverage in the Congress; there is a vested interest against educational improvement.

Establishment of agricultural credit institutions for farmers may threaten local rural moneylenders—or established urban banking interests. Channeling higher education resources into agricultural service and improvement would mean denying to middle- and upper-class students some of their present monopoly on university study, and limiting their opportunity to take liberal arts and law courses.

All these changes, the essential components of a serious land reform program, raise basic social and political issues. Nearly all will be as difficult to resolve as basic issues within our own country, now and in the past—States rights, slavery, tariffs, economic reform. All require the creation of new institutions and patterns of behavior. All will give rise to basic divisions in the countries affected—at the root, the question, "Who governs?"

Thus there is no such thing as "pure" economic development in Latin America. Development depends on change—on new balances of wealth and power between men, on new justice in the courts of the market. Economic development requires hard political decisions; it therefore depends on political leadership, political development, political change. A better life for the people of Latin America can only come out of progress

toward a better, more democratic political and social structure.

WHAT WE CAN DO

There are two ways in which the United States can help to accelerate comprehensive land reform in Latin America.

First, we can help with material assistance, in money and technology—for the training, schools, personnel, equipment, and roads which, as I have described, are necessary.

Agriculture, like any other industry, requires investment. All but a few Latin American nations are desperately short of investment capital; this we can help to supply.

We can help with technical assistance. In Venezuela, for example, 1 year's work by agricultural technicians taught farmers to increase their corn yields from 1,000 to 2,300 kilograms per hectare; they expect to reach 4,000 kilograms per hectare. But this experiment required a ratio of 1 technician to 30 farmers; to duplicate it throughout the hemisphere would require a million agricultural technicians.

Clearly, we do not have this many trained people. But we do have far greater resources than we now are using.

Our agriculture has been built, not by government, but through the work of the land-grant colleges, the State extension services, the voluntary associations such as the Grange and the 4-H clubs and the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union. We have made a first step toward using these State and local skills in a partnership between Chile and California and other similar partnerships of the Alliance.

But this is only a beginning. We could directly involve these institutions and individuals in the work of development—for example, by subcontracting our agricultural development program in a specific country to a single State or group of States. Through their own extension services, and the volunteer groups, they could supply managers for our AID funds. Without creating great new bureaucracies, we could secure the service—the energy and devotion and skills—of tens of thousands of Americans on less than a career basis.

In the long run, of course, all these jobs should be done by Latin American technicians; and we should help to train as many as are required. But Americans can help, on a short-term basis—and, given the opportunity, I believe they will.

Second, we can help Latin Americans meet the political challenges of land reform—above all, by clearly identifying and associating ourselves with the forces of reform and social justice. In nearly every Latin American nation elections are fought on the basis of the Alliance and its ideals; the great partnership that is the Alliance gives substantial weight to the opinions and feelings of other men and governments in the hemisphere. Strong association of the United States with land reform will everywhere help its supporters, and make others more reluctant to oppose it.

The basic work of reform, of course, is and must be for the people and governments of each Latin American nation.

There are limits to the role the United States can play; I will discuss those limits later. But we can help; and we certainly can help by not extending our material and moral support to those who actively oppose necessary political, economic, and social change, including the comprehensive land reform which is at the heart of development efforts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is an unusual and welcome speech. The Senator from New York has not only set forth appropriate goals but he is also spelling out in detail many hard, tough facts, unapproved but highly relevant to an understanding of South America.

I am particularly delighted at the Senator's linking of land reform and education.

I ask the Senator if it is not true, that to achieve effective land reform it is very important that the kind of education which is necessary for farmers to be productive be made available to Latin Americans? Would not the county agent system, which has been so enormously successful in this country—and the agricultural extension courses be immensely helpful to a successful program of land distribution among farmers? Is it not true that if farmers get land and do not have the ability, education, and training to enable them to utilize modern agriculture techniques, there not only could be an inability to produce but political reactions against the resultant rise of food prices?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. I think that that is the heart of it.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. If we concentrate only on redistribution of land and do not take other steps, so that when land is redistributed and a farmworker takes over some land and does not know how to till the soil, or use any of the more modern techniques to make his land productive, I think we are going to be in greater difficulty.

There is going to be an adverse reaction in the country and particularly in cities where a large portion of the population lives because food prices are going to go up. There is going to be an adverse reaction in the countryside because people are not going to get the benefits they expected.

The promise to them is not going to be fulfilled unless we take the other steps. At the same time we have land redistribution we must take the steps to make sure that those people who work with the land know how to use it and deal with it: We must make sure they are educated enough to use modern techniques that must be made available to them. An example of this would be how to use fertilizer.

The present Presiding Officer [Mr. HARRIS] and I traveled in the same area in Brazil last fall, and there we saw individuals working land 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for \$1.50 a week, with no possibility of educating their children or owning the land in the future, and without the kinds of agriculture training they

need to become useful citizens, or for their families to become useful citizens.

In my judgment, and I am sure in the judgment of the present Presiding Officer, as I have talked to him, this situation is going to be catastrophic, not only for that country but for the entire hemisphere.

As we concentrate on the problems of Vietnam and other problems that appear to be more explosive at the moment, I hope that we do not ignore this part of the world which is going to be so meaningful, not just for the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, but those who take over in this country, after we leave.

If the people in these countries feel that they have no future, that the land does not belong to them, that the society does not belong to them, and they cannot obtain a reasonable opportunity for their children in the future, in free institutions, they will move in different directions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am somewhat surprised, and I do not question the Senator's assertions, but I am surprised to find on page 11 the following statement:

This is the progress that is beginning in Latin America; but still for most Latin Americans there has been little progress, little fulfillment.

I had thought that statistics which I have seen for 1963, 1964, 1965, and a projection for 1966, indicated an increase in productivity in Latin America that has exceeded the goal set by the Alliance for Progress—not by much, but by a little, and that the per capita increase has also been somewhat better than had been expected.

Has this income been so badly distributed that most Latin Americans have been left out?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is one of the problems. Statistics are only numbers—they do not measure improvement in the lives of the poor. Also some countries have done much better than other countries.

If one were to look at the overall average he might be somewhat encouraged, since a good number of improvements have been made. But the population has grown so rapidly in many of these countries that the output per individual has not increased over the last 5 years.

I am going to talk about the expanding population within Latin America and some things that I believe need to be done about it.

With all of the effort we have made in the problems of Latin America, we have not gotten our heads above water because of the fact that many of these programs have not been so successful as they might have been; second, that the benefits have not been distributed properly; and third, the explosive population growth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I welcome the reference of the Senator both in his text and in his off-the-cuff remarks indicating a revolution is coming and the indications of that revolution. We have seen the terrible implications of revolution in Cuba. We realize what a threat that kind of bloody Communist revolution is to this country and to citizens in Wisconsin, New York, and other States. If

the revolution is not orderly, if it is not in the democratic direction, it is very likely to be in the other direction. The other direction could constitute a real threat to our security.

I also appreciate the Senator's realistic emphasis on the obstacles which we face; that this is not a situation where we can simply say we are for land reform and support some kind of government program or appropriation which would distribute land. The New York Senator stresses the point that it will require new institutions and new patterns of behavior, and change will require new struggle.

Unless we realize that there are going to be setbacks, and a lot of division in this country, as well as in South America over this kind of program, and a lot of dispute here about whether or not we can proceed in this kind of necessarily revolutionary way, I think we will not achieve what we wish to achieve.

I believe it is important that we recognize that it is going to be a long, tough, hard road. There will be setbacks and discouragement certainly for a while. We can expect to be at times in conflict with the government in authority in some Latin American nation over these objectives.

Unless we realize that, and are prepared for it, we may not have the heart to continue to help. This will take years, decades of patient, painstaking, costly, dangerous work for this country; but the alternative to this peaceful revolution may be a Cuban revolution on a continental basis, or a Vietnam military action against Communist subversion costing billions of dollars and many lives.

I believe it is most helpful that the Senator referred to what happened in Mexico. There was land redistribution, but in a few years the land was repurchased by large estates. Unless land reform is accompanied by a well-integrated program of agricultural training, transportation improvement, agriculture credit, and a number of other things that take time and patience, we will not help the Latin Americans to overcome the enormous obstacles that their countries face.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that as we realize the tremendous problems in Latin America, certainly Mr. Castro and those who are associated and identified with him also realize them. But for them, these problems create a potential for unrest and division.

In a broadcast from Havana in the last few weeks, a dozen countries were named in which Castro and communism are going to make a major effort, through violence, to overthrow the existing governmental structure.

We have a moral responsibility—and some people may take issue with this—because of our gross national product of approximately \$700 billion and because of the level of affluence that exists in this country.

Half the people of Latin America die before the age of 4 because they do not have enough to eat, because of lack of decent water, because of no doctors. I

do not think we can live in isolation from these problems that exist elsewhere in the world. We have that responsibility.

Beyond that, we have a problem of self-interest. We are spending now at least a billion dollars a month in Vietnam to kill people and to fight a war. What we are talking about here is funds for the whole of Latin America, to help them to help themselves. What we are talking about here, at this juncture, is the expenditure of money equivalent to that spent in 3 or 4 weeks in Vietnam, to help the people of Latin America to help themselves.

From the standpoint of our moral responsibility and our self-interest, we should head off what is likely to occur in the countries of Latin America during the next few years. This can be accomplished by taking the steps to which I have referred.

In traveling through Latin America, one is impressed by the fact that something can be done. It is not a situation in which one becomes discouraged. There are problems and difficulties, but something can be done. The leadership and direction of the United States and the interest of this country in the countries of Latin America are required in order to attain these goals. We cannot become interested in Latin America only at the time another Castro arises. If the Latin-American countries can only attract our interest, our concern, our leadership, and our direction by having another Castro, then it will be too late.

We learned our lesson during the 1950's. Castro's rise was not caused just by negligence on the part of this country. What brought about Mr. Castro and communism in Cuba was our support of Batista; and Batista, not Castro, was the major cause of communism in Latin America. The question is whether or not we learned the lesson of the fifties, so that we can apply it to the sixties. Are we learning the lesson of southeast Asia, so that we can apply it to Latin America?

This is the time we should take steps to head off difficulties 5 years from now. If we do not, we will not be able to head off these difficulties. If we say we do not have an emergency in Latin America and therefore we are not going to pay attention to that area and are not going to take the necessary steps, then we are going to pay for it in spades, in my judgment, for many years in the future.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

IV. EDUCATION THE NEED

Education is the second major problem embracing both progress and justice. And it is of primary importance to Latin America—as to every nation.

Education is not only important to understanding the world and each other—it is the key to the future, the foundation of progress in the modern world. No nation, not one, has entered the ranks of modern economic society without trained and educated people to run the factories, manage institutions, guide the government, draw plans. Without them all the money and loans are worthless.

Education is the key to progress of another kind: like land reform, it is a

passport to citizenship. As Horace Mann put it:

A human being is not, in any proper sense, a human being until he is educated.

Men without education are condemned to lives as outsiders—outside political life, outside the 20th century, foreigners in their own land. Men who are illiterate cannot read newspapers, or instruction manuals, or even the road signs by which we guide our footsteps. Even for those who can read, further education is the key to social and economic mobility and freedom; there can be no career open to the talents without the education which develops talent.

But education, the key to progress, is sadly lacking in Latin America. There are not nearly enough trained and educated people to run the machinery of modern society. And the illiteracy of 50 percent of all Latin Americans inhibits progress of all kinds—economic, social, and political.

Popular education, in the sense in which we understand it in the United States, is only beginning in most countries. The Latin American nations have made great efforts to build schools and add teachers in the last 5 years, increasing enrollment in primary schools by 6 percent yearly, and secondary enrollment by more than 10 percent a year.

But statistics of improvement can be misleading. The school-age population is also mushrooming—so that, in some countries, there are more illiterates now than there were 5 years ago. In rural Peru many primary schools do not go beyond the first grade; in none of the five countries we visited were there schools available for all children above even the third grade. And dropouts, due in large part to poverty, illness, and lack of facilities, make the top of the education pyramid narrow indeed. Of 1,400 Brazilian children, for example, 1,000 enter the first grade, and 396 the second. Of these, 169 finish the fourth grade; 20 complete high school; 7 enter some form of higher education institution—and perhaps 1 of the original 1,000 who entered the first grade will finally graduate from the university. That is 1 out of 1,400 Brazilian children. Even in Argentina, where 10 percent of the college-age population are enrolled in universities, only 4.9 percent of those who do enter the university leave it as graduates.

Quality standards also are often low. In Peru less than one-third of elementary school teachers have any professional training—and 15 percent themselves are only elementary-school graduates. Even in the universities throughout the hemisphere, professors can teach only part time, and must hold outside jobs to live. In Buenos Aires, at the best medical school in Latin America, 1 microscope and 1 cadaver must be shared by 40 students.

And the educational resources available are not sufficiently directed toward the task of development. Fully 20 percent of university students study law; an equal number study medicine; more pursue a classical liberal-arts curriculum. Less than one-twentieth of the students are preparing for work in the critical

field of agriculture, and too few prepare for work as engineers or teachers. Secondary schooling is academic, directed at university entrance—though only a small fraction of those who attend secondary schools ever enter college—and does not provide the skilled and semitechnical manpower which is needed in the factories and workshops of the continent.

The production of the educational system, in sum, is a very small group of professionals at the top; all too few middle-level workers, without vocational training; a great mass of the semieducated and semilliterate; and tens of millions, adults and children, without any education whatever.

PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Improving educational levels is by its nature a gradual process; there is no short cut. To teach more children, we need more teachers; to get more teachers, we need more college and high school graduates; to have more graduates, we need to teach more children.

The United States can help this process with money and with people. Already, Peace Corps volunteers teach thousands of children, and help many local communities to build schools. Many of our universities aid universities in Latin America; some have established branch campuses there, to advance the exchange of faculty, of students, and of ideas. U.S.-donated food feeds hundreds of thousands of students, and U.S. assistance has built thousands of new schoolrooms throughout the hemisphere. All these efforts can and should be intensified, especially efforts to build educational institutions, as by aid to departments of education. I welcome President Johnson's new emphasis on education in our international development programs.

There is a type of educational assistance which we have not yet made available to Latin America; I urge that efforts to make it available go forward with all possible speed. In the last few years, our universities and industry have developed dozens of new educational techniques—teaching machines, educational television, programmed instruction. No one contends that these machines are all there is to education; but they can make a major contribution to learning where teachers are in short supply and poorly trained. We should now investigate the applicability of our new techniques to education in Latin America, especially at the primary level. And we should help Latin Americans acquire and use whatever, out of our educational inventory, will be of help to them.

I would point out that not all these resources will be found in universities. One of Latin America's greatest needs, for example, is for subprofessional medical personnel, to work in the remote rural areas. The greatest body of such personnel that we have developed are the medical corpsmen of the armed services. I suggest that we now explore ways in which the trained technicians and experience which have been developed in the military can be made available to Latin America, so that they may develop medical technicians competent to meet the most pressing needs of people in areas without doctors. But our money

or teachers or techniques or administrators can do only the smallest part of the necessary job.

We can help make school available to more people. But more schools will not themselves erase the poverty which largely causes the overwhelming dropout rates. Keeping more children in school, therefore, requires major improvements in the lot of the poor: comprehensive land reform in the countryside, and increased employment in the cities. Without such economic progress and social reform, great new investments in education will largely be wasted; all must go forward together.

Moreover, the aid we offer will not be used unless Latin Americans themselves make hard political decisions—decisions to open education to a far wider proportion of their people, and not reserve it as a privilege of the more fortunate few. In some countries, such as Brazil, for example, secondary schooling is mostly private, and universities are supported by the States. Thus, those who can afford to pay for high school are given free higher education; but most of those who cannot pay for secondary schooling do not get even that. For this policy to be reversed—the state to pay for high school and possibly a different policy to govern fees for university study—is a political decision for democracy, which is a Latin American responsibility.

Above all, improving education requires decisions by those now receiving an education to contribute their time and work to the education of their countrymen. This elite—the university students—are the key to better general education, as they are to every other hope for progress in their society. But this is another problem.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

"Problem" because it is just that. Part of the problem is politics. The University of Caracas has for some years been the center and command post of Communist terrorism in Venezuela; other universities elsewhere are also centers of extremist politics. We need only note what has been happening at the University of Mexico City. Fidel Castro was not the first Latin American revolutionary to come out of student politics—nor will he be the last. One Latin American president told me that the students were his second most serious source of difficulty. And one of the most disturbing moments of my 3 weeks in Latin America was when a group of Communist students burned the American flag.

Not all student activists are extremist or irresponsible. Many Latin American students have in the past given their lives for independence and freedom. Many others have come to lead their nations toward reform and progress, such as Presidents Betancourt and Belaunde and Frei. There are activists today, building schools and roads and clinics and houses, the first generation of Latin American students to soil their hands and bend their backs. There are Peruvian students working in the slums of Lima and in the Andean villages. Some Chilean students are the backbone of the Peace Corps-type programs in their own country. And I saw Venezuelan

students working in community-action programs in the barrios of Caracas.

But those who are radical and not active are far more numerous than those who are active—whether extremist or constructive. And in this combination of extreme speech and little action is great danger for their countries, and for the United States.

The primary danger is that the real problems of Latin America, which depend greatly for their solution on these very students, will go unsolved.

A second danger is that extreme speech will contribute to further political and social instability.

And a third danger is that the social problems aggravated by inaction will be blamed upon the United States.

I saw this happen again and again in my travel last fall. Students in Peru blamed the United States for the military coup in Brazil. Students in Venezuela blamed the United States for the weakness of the OAS. Students in Chile blamed the United States for their border quarrel with Argentina. And students everywhere blamed the United States for poverty and stagnation in their own countries. Repeatedly, I had to state the simple fact that what the United States did would mean far less to their countries than what they themselves could do.

What are the roots of extremism among the sons of a class which has been privileged for 300 years?

Partly, it is simple nationalism. For most of their history, the upper classes of Latin America have neglected their own nations, preferring to enjoy the benefits of a cosmopolitan European culture. But the post-World War II period has seen a resurgence of national feeling all over the globe and the birth of dozens of new nations from the former colonies of the great powers. It is not so easy, now, to be without a nation in which to take pride. The Latin American countries are weak and poor and not "modern." They suffer badly, in the eyes of their young men, by comparison with the United States.

To demand sweeping change is to be "modern"; to be anti-United States is not only "modern," but brave; to be Marxist is to be at once anti-United States and intellectual.

A second reason is the obvious demand of justice. No man is insensitive, and young people are particularly sensitive, to justice: to the demands of the landless and the sick and the untaught. The manifestoes of leftwing students in Latin America, in fact, are often less advanced in many respects than the platform of the Democratic Party in the United States, or than the Conservative Party in England. It is often a measure not of themselves but of their societies that these students are cast in the role of extremists.

But more than anything else, I think, these students are what they are out of the desire "not only to equal or resemble, but to excel"; the desire which John Adams said "next to self-preservation will forever be the great spring of human actions." The students I saw seem to have sensed that their societies, as

presently constituted, have not enough room for achievement; that they have inadequate opportunity to establish themselves on the great stage of public affairs, to dare and to achieve for their countries and for their posterity.

STUDENTS: WHAT WE CAN DO

There is much we can do to help the students of Latin America, and to help ourselves with these students.

First, we should extend all possible help to the improvement of their education generally; through financial assistance, to improve their university facilities and faculties; through help for the creation of entirely new universities; through assistance for secondary schools to aid their preparation for college.

Second, we should devote greater thought and effort to conveying to these students the truth about the United States. Partly this is a matter of learning how to talk to them. We tell them, for example, that we have a "capitalist" economy, and that they would do well to follow our example. But this does not mean to them what it means to us; to them, "capitalism" stands for the rapacious and irresponsible colonial economy of their history, and 9 out of 10 of them say they are opposed to it. We should find a better way of describing our own society—one which more accurately conveys to them what the facts are here. And we should be clear in our own minds about what our society represents, what we personally believe about our society, and what it stands for. I think John Buchan, Lord Tweedsmuir in his autobiography gave an impressive definition of "democracy."

He said:

Democracy, the essential thing as distinguished from this or that democratic governments—was primarily an attitude of mind, a spiritual testament, and not an economic structure or a political machine. The testament involved certain basic beliefs—that the personality was sacrosanct, which was the meaning of liberty; that policy should be settled by free discussion; that normally a minority should be ready to yield to a majority, which in turn should respect a minority's sacred things. It seemed to me that democracy had been in the past too narrowly defined and had been identified illogically with some particular economic or political system such as laissez-faire or British parliamentarism. I could imagine a democracy which economically was largely socialist and which had not our constitutional pattern.

But words or messages will work no magic changes among Latin American students. I know that, ever since the onset of the cold war, we have been urged to develop a concise, exciting American manifesto—a platform which would compete with the simple rousing calls of the Communists. But what matters about this country cannot be put into slogans; it is a process, a way of doing things and dealing with people, a way of life. There are two major ways of telling others what this country is really about; to bring people here, or to send Americans abroad.

We should, therefore, expand our programs to send students and teachers of all kinds to Latin America and to bring Latin American students to the United States. This is more, I would add, than a

matter of opening places in universities here.

Too often, students who do come here have little contact with the substance of our life. There are thousands of Latin American students in New York City alone. But programs to help them understand us—to meet not just with other students, but with government officials, and labor and business and community leaders, and ordinary citizens outside New York City—these programs are too often scattered and fragmentary, or even nonexistent. And the same situation holds true all across the country. I urge that we give increased support and encouragement to such programs; not in a spirit of salesmanship or propaganda, but in an honest effort to help these students see our own blemishes along with our assets, and the ways in which we are dealing with our problems. They will appreciate our candor. And I have confidence that the overall picture they receive can only be a positive one.

One concrete step we can and should take is the establishment of centers of study and meeting for Latin American students in the United States. Where any one should be located is less important than that it is established.

Third, we should give to the youth of Latin America a full chance to participate in the building of their continent. That chance is available to some; but the students of Argentina, for example, have no organized opportunity to serve in Peace Corps type work, though many have expressed a desire to do so. I therefore propose that consideration be given to urging more Latin American nations to form their own peace corps—a step which Brazil has just taken and a form of which has been taken in Peru, Chile, and Venezuela. But I believe we should go further. We should consider also the formation of a multinational hemispheric peace corps in which Americans from both North and South could join for work in their own or other American countries, as well as in the United States. The Peace Corps has shown that young people can make a difference—to individuals, to communities, to whole nations. It has given to thousands of young Americans an opportunity for direct action in support of their ideals; and a hemispheric peace corps can and should do the same for Americans south of the Rio Grande. I would hope that our own Peace Corps would become clearly aligned with it; the two corps should work together.

The benefits of such participation would be as great for us as for them. It could add to the efforts of our Peace Corps, and to the work of such groups as the International Volunteer Service and the Papal Volunteers, thousands of eager workers, thoroughly knowledgeable about Latin America. If our young people joined in this effort they could give to their Latin American compatriots a far improved knowledge of the United States. And such a corps might one day become the nucleus of a true hemispheric community.

Fourth, we should permit all those—students, professors, writers and others—who wish to come to this country to do

so, regardless of whether their political or economic views are in agreement with our own. Too often, we have even denied entry to distinguished Latin American scholars, working with U.S. universities, because of their supposed political views. But the theory of our Constitution, as we hope will be the theory of other constitutions, is that, as Justice Holmes said:

The best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the marketplace.

We need not fear the presence of dissenting voices, whether of our own citizens or of Latin Americans or others. And our willingness to listen—and to let even our critics see our strengths and our weaknesses—will, not only be a clear demonstration of our own basic faith in our veracity and our ideals, but will in my judgment, make a distinct impression on the students and young intellectuals of Latin America.

Fifth, let us preserve always a sense of perspective and balance in our judgments. There is, on the extreme left, a highly disciplined, highly motivated minority. But even these students are not necessarily Communists, and we should neither unduly bemoan their victories nor trumpet their defeats. When I was in Indonesia in 1962, the mass of students were, if anything, more vocal in their anti-Americanism and Marxism than the students I saw in Latin America. Yet the same Indonesian student organizations, perhaps many of the same individual students, led anti-Chinese and anti-Communist demonstrations in 1965 and 1966—and helped oust the China-oriented Foreign Minister and install the Nationalist-neutralist army in power.

The students had not suddenly become pro-American or even anti-Communist; but they saw foreign-supported communism as a threat to their national independence, and reacted as strongly as they would have if the United States had tried to dominate their country.

Among those students who are bitterly critical of the United States, even among those who call themselves Communists we should not abandon our efforts. During my Latin American tour, I spoke to the students of the University of Santiago. The only students opposed to my speaking were not the orthodox Communists, but the militant Chinese-oriented group; they threw eggs and tried to shout me down for 25 minutes. Other students, standing up for my right to be heard, threw these extremists bodily out of the hall. Many of the students who remained, indeed many of those who threw out the Communists, were highly critical of the United States. But they would fight to listen to a representative of the United States speak and answer their questions and defend his country against their accusations.

The next night, at Concepción, a hundred extremists, better organized, were able to prevent me from speaking. But they did so at the cost of alienating most of the rest of the students, and exposing the weakness of their position. At a meeting before my appearance, I told the extremist students I would ad-

mit that the United States had made mistakes; challenged them to debate their case before their fellow students and asked whether they would admit their wing of the Communist Party had ever made a mistake. Their answer was "no" to the debate and "yes" to the question—they said their mistake was not making a revolution in Chile. These replies had a profound effect on the other students present.

Let me add one final point. We should not become discouraged because of these incidents. That is exactly what the Communists wish to accomplish. They realize that rudeness, disorder, violence receives considerable publicity in the United States. They are also aware that people in the United States become disturbed and concerned and wonder whether our efforts of friendship are worthwhile.

Let me say I believe our efforts are productive. In Concepción tens of thousands of people poured out into the streets in a demonstration of friendship. They know about the United States—and they represent the feeling of the people for this country. Less than 100 students out of 1,000 caused the disturbance that evening. And before the night was out they were involved with anti-Communists in a pitched battle which raged for several hours. I would not regard the students of Latin America as "lost" to their countries or to the hemisphere as a whole.

We just cannot permit a well-disciplined, articulate vocal minority to intimidate or discourage us. If we stand up and demonstrate that we are prepared to meet them face to face, that we will not be intimidated, that we will talk with them; that we will exchange views with them; that we will debate them; yes, even that we know some students who believe in freedom of speech who if they wish it will fight them—we shall be successful; not immediately perhaps, but, given the wisdom of our other policies, slowly and inexorably.

These students are the future leaders of their countries. They do have a great reservoir of patriotism and idealism, and a basic belief in the importance of the individual. They are worth listening to, and worth talking to with patience and candor; they are worth, in fact, all the time and effort we can spare. It is easier to talk to government officials, or to businessmen, or to other North Americans; and too often, only one or two members of an entire Embassy staff ever talk with students. I urge instead that all members of our embassies, as well as the many U.S. officials and citizens who travel in Latin America, try to achieve some personal contact, some dialogue with individual students and student groups.

UNIVERSITIES AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

It should be apparent that the universities of the United States have a great contribution to make—to Latin American education, agriculture, and public administration; to the Alliance for Progress; and thus to the national interest of the United States. But revelations of recent months, even days, show that the sincerity and prestige of our universities

have been seriously compromised by arrangements with agencies of the U.S. Government.

The first of these was a study named "Camelot." The Department of the Army commissioned this study from a group at American University. The Army, with intelligent foresight, was attempting to find out what social, economic, and political factors might influence the growth or decline of insurgent movements. But the Army was not the proper agency to do the study; and the study itself, designed by the university, seems to have been so clumsily drawn as to antagonize any self-respecting Latin American. One does not, for example, ask a Latin American political leader—for that matter, any political leader—how he feels about his parents. The study was to have been conducted in secret; when the news inevitably leaked, U.S. university studies throughout Latin America came under hostile suspicion as tools of the Pentagon.

The embarrassment of Camelot has now been compounded by the revelation that a Michigan State University mission in Vietnam was a cover for the CIA, and that the respected Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology was set up in part with CIA funds. Surely, every U.S. university mission, all over the world, will now be suspect—impairing, to some unknown degree, their ability to function as scholars and teachers.

It was for just this reason that the center at Massachusetts Institute of Technology has announced that it has severed its connection with the CIA; not because it felt that its academic integrity was compromised, but because of the suspicion and distrust that was unavoidable abroad.

In large part, we in the Congress must bear responsibility for this situation. Camelot was undertaken by the Army because far more research funds are available to the Army than are appropriated to the Department of State, or AID, or other nonmilitary institutions. The same shortage of research funds to nonmilitary agencies was also the reason why CIA funds were given to Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I support the new policy which gives to the State Department, and to the Ambassador in each country, control over U.S. Government-sponsored research abroad. But the problem of universities becoming identified with undercover and military agencies will continue so long as those agencies have the great preponderance of foreign research appropriations. The Department of State, and the Agency for International Development, should therefore seek major increases in their research budgets, with corresponding reductions in such budgets for the military and the intelligence agencies.

And we should now take such administrative steps as are required to insure that intelligence agencies do not use our universities as covers or tools. Unless we now take unequivocal action, the universities will not be of great further use to the CIA in any case; we must try to salvage their reputation for serious academic work.

For the truest test, the surest message, of our nature and our principles will be found in what we do. We will not build respect for our academic institutions, or traditions of university independence, by using them for intelligence work. And exchange programs or even shared work in projects in slums and villages will be ineffective, in the long run, unless we maintain our commitment to progress, justice, and freedom—in Latin America and at home—to the ideals of the Alliance and to our own tradition. More than anyone else, the students of Latin America will be watching.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. I may want to make a comment later on as to the other aspects of the Senator's excellent address, but I should like to comment briefly now, and ask a question or two about this subject.

Let me say that while the Senate as an institution may from time to time engage in discussion dealing with foreign relations matters which are already in a crisis stage, I believe that the Senate rises to its highest responsibility in the field of foreign relations, under its constitutional directive, to advise and consent in this area and to assist in the making of policy, before the subject reaches the crisis stage.

I feel that Latin America is of the greatest importance to the future of the United States and to the peace and security of the world. The Senator from New York, not only through his interest in this area of the world during the time he served in the administration of President Kennedy, and through his recent tour of South America, but also through this first of his two addresses on the floor of the Senate on this subject, will help very much to focus the attention of the people of this country on the importance of Latin America to them.

It could be summed up—and this is what the people in this country need more and more to know—there, as elsewhere in the world, in five or six words; namely, "desperate, downtrodden people will rise." If the history of our country, or of the world, teaches anything, it is just that.

I believe that the Senator has very well stated what must be the prime base of our policy, what is, fortunately the case under the Alliance for Progress, that simple, economic aid without real revolution—political, economic, and social revolution—will come to naught, and that the things we do must all be focused in that direction.

To me, that is the heart of what the Senator has stated to this moment in his excellent address. Those are things which the people of this country must understand, that we must take an interest in Latin America, that it is not only an affront to our conscience that the people down there are so downtrodden and desperate, but also our own enlight-

ened self-interest is involved. Unless we appeal to those deprived people, they will rise up in revolution until they shake the foundations of our own peace and security. I stated at the beginning that the Senator has brought these points home in his speech. It is something we need to understand.

I am particularly taken by the Senator's comments about the students in South America, the force that they are, and the explanation he has given as to their general attitude and feeling—which worry some of us perhaps more than it should. But I believe that we must do as the Senator suggests, take a greater interest in them.

I believe that idealism has become the pragmatism of our day. I believe that there exists in the minds of the students in Latin America the same kind of feeling, the same kind of desire to be of assistance to other people which existed in this country when President Kennedy came forward with the Peace Corps idea.

I believe that one of the major benefits which perhaps will come from the address of the Senator from New York is the idea of a multinational, hemispheric Peace Corps.

I therefore wish to ask the Senator—I know that he talked about it as he visited the student groups in South America—what sort of reaction he received from students to the idea that they themselves might be an instrument for greater justice in their own countries and surrounding countries?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let me first comment on the remarks he made at the beginning, the way he summarized what I believe to be the basic problem that we have to deal with in Latin America, and what will govern our relationships there.

I say that even if we appropriate \$2 billion, \$3 billion, or \$4 billion, unless we have this idealism, unless we accept the fact that people will advance their lives, and we identify with that, the money will be wasted. Anyone who feels that because Latin America lacks the financial help from the United States it does not progress, in my judgment, makes a major mistake. That is not what the problem is basically. The basic problem is that what we have to do—here in the United States, all of us, especially the Federal Government which has that particular responsibility—is to realize that there is a revolution now going on down there, and we must identify ourselves with that revolution.

Let me say that I was impressed with the friendliness of the people of Latin America toward the United States. We have preached to them the dignity of the individual, the fact that we want to help them lead their own lives and to determine their own destinies. We have told them about our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

However, that does not mean very much to a father who cannot get a job, to a father who must work on a farm for 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for only \$1.50, or a man who sees half his children die before they reach the age of 1. Look over Latin America as a whole, and we

see that half the burials that take place there are in coffins less than 4 feet long, because those who died were under the age of 4.

We must recognize these facts, and identify ourselves with them. We must put ourselves in their shoes. We would not accept such conditions in this country. The Senator from Oklahoma would not accept them. I would not accept them—neither would anyone else in this country, no matter how many persons came to us and preached about free institutions and democracy and how awful communism is.

We can say that communism does terrible things, that there are no free institutions under communism. But how can it be any worse there, where men and women and their children are mostly illiterate, and they cannot vote in an election, because there are no schools and there is no way to receive an education? But we go down there and tell them about the dangers of communism, that they must be for democracy because communism is so dangerous.

What does that mean to them? It would not mean anything to the Senator from Oklahoma. It would not mean anything to me. I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the Chamber—the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee, who knows more about this subject than any of us—and I know it would not mean anything to him, or to anyone else in this country who has any feeling for his family, let alone his country.

That is what we are facing. We have come to a crossroad. We must either move down and give some attention to this problem and realize that this is the kind of society we want to be identified and associated with, that this is the kind of leadership we plan to give the rest of the world, or we must move back and decide that we will stay in the United States and not be concerned about the rest of the world, nor give it leadership.

We should make that decision, one way or the other. We cannot go half way. Therefore, I know that what the Senator from Oklahoma has stated is absolutely correct, that we must identify ourselves and relate ourselves to the fact that a revolution in Latin America is coming, and will come, either with free institutions, or with extremism on the left or right—which will eventually end in extremism of the left which, in my judgment, will be communism.

As I said earlier, I think we have the responsibility because it is morally right to do so. As was said at one time, we cannot save the few who are rich if we are not willing to help the many who are poor. Unless we do not take that kind of step, we are headed for catastrophe.

Mr. HARRIS. I was wondering if the Senator would comment on the challenges he issued, about which I read in the Spanish language newspapers, with regard to the students in Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think the answer is that they have a great interest in doing something. Just as in the 1950's here in the United States, there was a need for a vehicle for idealism so that is true now in Latin America.

In time of war, people are asked to go out and fight and, if necessary, die for their country, whether it be a democracy or some other kind of government. Then they come back from the war and into the community. If they have an education, they are able to get a good job, earn a good living, and try to provide a better life for their children.

I think it is the idealism that they feel for their fellow citizens that exists there. President Kennedy pointed it out in 1961. That same feeling exists in Latin America today, and what they really need is a proper vehicle to use that idealism.

In Brazil we heard complaints that in the United States we emphasize the concept of financial gain. As I went out to the villages, saw students working there from the United States, but I very rarely saw students from local colleges. I said, "If you feel so strongly about it, why are you not out there working for the people?" The fact is that they must have a vehicle that is organized, such as VISTA is organized, and as other vehicles are organized to help people. In the last week, I have learned that in that country they have organized a peace corps, which I think will be very effective.

So it was very plain to me, and I was struck by the fact that, so far as the student is concerned, it is idealism that motivates him; he wants a better society for the people in Latin America. If there were some vehicle established for him to express that idealism, he would be better equipped to help the people.

Anyone who has gone to a university, who has any conscience at all, has a feeling for those who have not had that opportunity and a feeling that he wants to make some contribution.

I had the convictions while in Latin America that if we helped them to fulfill their expressions, with their talent, energy, and experience the people there would gain, as well as the people in other countries, and the people of the world.

Mr. HARRIS. I also wanted to comment on the Senator's statement with regard to land reform. I agree that, while it is true that as a result of land redistribution, there is the probability that in many areas production in agriculture will go down initially, the primary benefit of land reform and redistribution will be a change in the political balance, because unless one now has political influence in the government, he is not going to get much change in education, for example, and that person is not going to have much influence in the government as long as he is only a serf in a feudalistic system.

I think it is imperative that we understand that land reform, as indicated in the Senator's speech—which I am sure will receive wide report and I am confident will be read by people in South America—is one of the central ideas of the Alliance for Progress, and key part of that program.

When I was in Argentina, I read a good deal of what happened to the Senator in Concepcion, and at other meetings of that type, particularly one other

meeting at Santiago. I read and heard about what took place while I was in Argentina, and also later when I was in Chile, after the Senator was there. The upshot was that these things were a plus for us, a boost for our image, because it indicated to the people that we favor open debate and that the minority critics were fearful of open discussion. It also indicated that the Senator stood for free and open debate, and that most of the people there did not countenance the activity carried on by a minority there.

I talked with some students in Santiago and I found they were totally ignorant of the fact that we were pushing for land reform. Of course, it was being advocated by President Frei, they said, but they almost refused to believe that we were pushing it.

They said, "Oh, you say you're for land reform, but when these measures get before the Parliament here, the landed people, who have great access to the press, will say it is the first step toward communism and your people will finally oppose it."

Can the Senator tell us authoritatively that we cannot have substantial progress in the Alliance for Progress unless there is progress in one of its basic tenets, which is land reform, and that this is and will be the strong position of our Government?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not think there is any question that we believe, that that is what we stand for. I think it has been indicated quite clearly by the U.S. Ambassador to Chile. I think, however, it is important that we keep that in the forefront of our minds, that we do not lose track of the fact that land reform is a central part of the Alliance for Progress. What is of some concern, may I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, is that the Alliance for Progress may become just an aid program, a bilateral arrangement between the United States and a particular country to aid and assist that country. That was not the basis of the Alliance for Progress concept. It was to be a joint effort on behalf of the United States and Latin American countries, working together.

Second, it was not to be merely an aid program for financial assistance, but was to be part of a social reform, of which land reform was to be an important part. I think it is important that we keep pumping hard at that concept and that we do not emphasize how much money we provide; that it does not become a foreign aid program only; that we do not get merely to a bilateral aid program between the United States and countries of Latin America.

The Alliance for Progress, the relationship of the United States and the Latin American countries, in my judgment, requires a soul and heart. The land reform proposal provides that. Our interest is to improve the lives of the people in Latin America, and not just the economic, social, and political ruling classes.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say one last thing? I do not want to keep the Senator from New York too long. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Govern-

ment Research of the Committee on Government Operations, I was particularly interested in the Senator's statement with regard to universities and their connection with intelligence agencies.

I think the Senator is quite right. There must not be any connection between intelligence agencies and social and behavioral science research in foreign countries by American universities. I think further that such research, while it can be helpful to us and the host country in the formation of policy, ought to be "civilianized," either through the State Department or AID, as the Senator suggested.

I would like to have the comment of the Senator. Perhaps it should be some new apparatus in the Government. Since Defense, which now largely finances this kind of research, has funds available for this kind of research, such new apparatus might use beginning funds from other agencies for this type of research. Thereby we might civilianize this type of activity, which we need to do, because we already have too much of a militaristic image in Latin America.

I think that programs such as Camelot or Simpatico aggravate that situation and make it worse.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator. I thought about where it could be placed, and I thought about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has had much experience in research.

There is a difficulty, and I do not have a closed mind—perhaps the Senator's committee could go into it further—but the fact is that they had so obviously little experience in other countries, it might be difficult for them to do it. I came back and suggested that it be handled in some way through the State Department. There might be a better way to deal with the problem. I was not able to resolve it in my own mind. Perhaps if the Senator from Oklahoma holds hearings he could look into the matter to see if there is a better way.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There might be a better way to deal with it than I have suggested.

Mr. HARRIS. As a part of that last question, I note what the Senator has said on page 17 of the text which I have, which says:

But we can help; and we certainly can help by not extending our material and moral support to those who actively oppose necessary political, economic and social change, including the comprehensive land reform which is at the heart of development efforts.

It has been my concern—and I use the conversation I had with students in Santiago as an example—that while we do believe in these basic principles of change, we are not getting that fact across to the people themselves. I believe that there have to be more dramatic ways of bringing that fact to the attention of the average person with whom we must identify in Latin America.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator mean by that statement which I just read, even though it might be a little difficult in certain cases, perhaps we might withhold aid from an administration or perhaps types of aid from an administration which did not believe in the types of programs which the Alliance for Progress puts us on record as favoring?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I am suggesting to the Senator, and to the Senate.

First, I think the entire idea of the Alliance for Progress and the aid aspects of that program is to improve the lives of people there.

Therefore, if the financial assistance that is to come from the United States is going to achieve that purpose, the heart of the effort must be land reform plus education. If they have not established a system within a country to bring about necessary land reform or to improve education, the money, in my judgment, is going to be lost. It is not a question of cutting off the funds. The point is that kind of waste was not the purpose of the Alliance for Progress or of the assistance program. I think it is fraud to give assistance or funds when the money is going to be wasted or go to a few wealthy and powerful individuals in the country. I believe that is a grave mistake and identifies and associates the United States with the wrong group in Latin America.

It would be self-defeating and a waste of money and cause us immeasurable harm.

I wish to say one other thing to the Senator before he takes his seat. In his opening statement he talked about the idea that we frequently respond to crises in the United States. I would like to have the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, who was in Latin America at the same time that I was, about how important it is that we can make a difference in Latin America.

Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly do agree. I would say that when I talked with the distinguished Senator from New York after he came back from Latin America and told him that I came back rather depressed, he said that he was not so depressed, but was optimistic. Then he said, in explanation, that he felt there were things we could do, and therefore, that he was optimistic, although depressed by some of the facts.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I could not agree more. There are things that we can do and must do, which the Senator is bringing to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator agree that the things we can do, we can and must do now?

The Senator and I might stand up in the Senate 2 or 3 years from now and it might be too late to do some of these things.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the Senator. We must not wait, otherwise we are going to go from crisis to crisis, from the Dominican Republic to Vietnam.

We are called upon now to do things in a preventive way.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. We can see in our policies, perhaps in Vietnam or other areas, that if we had taken steps maybe a decade, or 3, 4, or 5 years prior to the present time, the situation would be quite different than it is.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is correct. Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am suggesting that there are steps that can be taken dealing with the problems of Latin America.

I think that the foremost reason to do it, in my judgment, is that we have a responsibility to help because of the kind of country we are. Second, not looking at it from that point of view, I hear the word "pragmatic" used so frequently nowadays—we are looking at it for our own self-interest. The time is now. What we might do now, from a monetary view, would save 10 times as much financially.

If we had dealt with Cuba and Batista in the fifties we would not have to worry about Castro. What made communism in Cuba was the policy of the United States during the fifties. It was not the fact that we had some support for Castro when he came from the mountains, but the relationship which we had with Batista at that time.

Now we can take steps to head off crises in the future. That is why I thought the point that the Senator made was so excellent.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Senator for his statement and for yielding to me. Also, since I quite agree with his thesis, just stated, I commend him for what I believe to be a landmark and monumental speech in this field.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from New York that in my opinion this is the most important speech that has been made on Latin American problems in this body and in this country since President Kennedy initiated the Alliance for Progress program and made his last speech, in which he gave an accounting of what the Alliance for Progress was doing and what he hoped for it.

I think this speech updates the Alliance for Progress program in a clear statement of its objectives.

The Senator from New York has said the things about the Alliance for Progress and its objectives that have needed saying since the last great address of President Kennedy on the subject to which I referred.

I hope that this statement of the Senator from New York will be caught by the media of information in this country. It is a very basic statement, if we are to have the proper understanding of the Alliance for Progress and if we are to have the reexamination of the program that I believe is so sorely needed.

When the Senator from New York points out that the great danger is that the Alliance for Progress will be looked upon as just another aid program, he goes to the heart of the present problem that confronts the future of the Alliance for Progress. The reason for this situation,

and the blame for it, rests in part on our country, but at least in an equal part—and I am afraid more than an equal part—on our neighbors in Latin America.

In some of our recent international conferences with Latin American officials, a tendency has developed on the part of many Latin American leaders to make a false assumption which stems from the time when President Kennedy was still a member of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs. In that subcommittee the seeds of the Alliance for Progress were sown, before Senator John F. Kennedy went to the White House as President. Many of the Latin American leaders forget what the purpose of the Alliance was. It was not designed primarily as a so-called dollar aid program. Yet, in listening to many Latin American leaders in conferences these days, one cannot escape the conclusion that many of them think that that is the primary purpose of the program.

The Senator from New York has pointed out ably in his speech today, as did President Kennedy—as we tried also to do at the time of the Bogotá Conference, which was the forerunner of the action that was taken in the Senate committee, and as we subsequently tried to point out at the time of the Conference at Punta del Este—that the Alliance for Progress is designed to be of assistance to the democratic leaders in Latin America, as they are developed, to bring about the necessary social, economic, and political reform that must be achieved in many of those countries if the danger of communism is to be met.

This is basic to an understanding of our foreign relations with Latin America. That is why it is very gratifying to hear the Senator from New York say what I have heard this afternoon, statements that I have felt for a long time needed to be said. They need to be said over and over again.

Our problem is to help people. Our problem is to use our largess to the extent that we provide dollar aid. However, of even more value to Latin America, we should provide for the exportation of our techniques, of the information that we can supply them, of the skills that can come from the people in our country. If we export the skills of people in our country by way of exchanges with Latin America, we can do more for Latin America than any number of American dollars.

I have become concerned from my discussions with many Latin American officials recently because they apparently think the American dollar is the answer. The American dollar, improperly used, can cause much more trouble than help.

What we must do is to accomplish what President Kennedy envisioned. When President Kennedy was a Member of the Senate and was a member of the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, we talked time and time again about this matter. We have to export to Latin America something more precious and worth much more than just American dollars. We have to export techniques, and an understanding of our economic system.

I do not mean to make a speech, but the Senator from New York is responsible

for these remarks. He has stimulated them. I have tried to live with this problem. There was a need for someone to say what the Senator from New York has said this afternoon.

We must consider what we can do, in addition to aiding them with money and sending to them the information, the skills, and the techniques that will help them to develop their own free society. We cannot export a free society to them. We make the mistake, in our foreign affairs, to try to export our free society. It cannot be done. Freedom has to grow in their own soil, in their own culture, among their own people.

I am glad that the Senator from New York stressed in his discussion this afternoon the point that the Alliance for Progress must not become a program of mere dollar aid. I am glad the Senator from New York said some other things in his speech that needed to be said.

I hope our Latin American friends will take note. I hope that when they take note, they will realize what a very good friend of theirs has said.

One of the difficulties of speaking in the Senate is that a Senator's comments might be interpreted as not a complete endorsement of something that is occurring in a Latin American country; then the Senator is considered unfriendly to that country.

The fact is that those of us who are trying to make the Alliance for Progress work as it was originally envisioned by President Kennedy are friends of Latin America. I say to the people of Latin America that in my judgment they do not have a better friend in the Senate than the Senator from New York.

The Senator from New York spoke of the educational problems in Latin America and the reactions of the students there. We must say to those students, as the Senator from New York has said, that they have to do more than they are doing in their countries in order to bring about the implementation of the ideals about which they talked to Senator KENNEDY when he was in Latin America and engaged in open and frank discussions with them.

There should be not only American young men and women in a Peace Corps in Latin America. There should be an American and Latin American Peace Corps, including students from all Latin American countries. With this kind of combined Peace Corps, the day will be hastened when the changes will be achieved about which the Senator from New York has spoken. I am glad that the Senator from New York spent as much time as he did on the need to meet the educational crisis in Latin America.

I say dogmatically—because it is a dogmatism that cannot be successfully challenged—that there is no hope for the development in Latin America of what we consider economic and political freedom for the mass of the people of Latin America because of the rate of illiteracy that presently prevails. Economically and politically free people cannot be developed out of ignorance. They have to be educated at least to the level of literacy.

This brings me to the International Education Act of President Johnson. I enthusiastically support this act so far as its objectives are concerned. The Senator from New York is a member of my subcommittee, as is the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in the Chamber. Our subcommittee will conduct extensive hearings in connection with this act. We shall do everything we can to help the President implement it into legislative form. It may need some revisions.

The Senator from New York made some suggestions this afternoon in regard to the bill. What we do in American universities and colleges in preparing to be of help educationally in Latin America is only a small part of the job. It is important. It provides for the training of personnel. We must provide facilities to which they can send students to be trained in the programs so that they can go back to Latin America and help. That is very important.

The President has in mind, and has said so very clearly, that he, too, recognizes, however, that the other part of the coin is the development of an educational program at the mass level in each of the Latin American countries.

I happen to think—maybe out of bias—that that is far more important than the program at the level of our colleges and universities in the United States. But I want them to go forward together.

We are not doing as much under the bill as I think we can and should do in connection with the mass educational programs.

In each one of the Latin American countries I think that the literacy program ought to go forward along with the program in the United States. I hope that when we get into our hearings we can be helpful to the President in making a record that will support and strengthen the bill so that it will not be limited, as it is limited now for the most part, to the so-called U.S. domestic aspect of international education program.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. In my speech I mentioned the possibility of furnishing in Latin America, to lower grades particularly, some of the advanced techniques we have been developing and which we have discussed so thoroughly and completely before our committee. It was based on the hearings, in which we discussed the effort that had to be made among disadvantaged people in the United States, that I raised the question as to whether some of the techniques and information which was being developed in the United States could be correlated and made available in Latin America.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator in his speech pointed out some of the techniques involved in the entire subject of literacy courses that could be conducted by television and, to some extent, even by radio or by visual aid. I think that we should try to do that. I do not think that we should wait to attack the

literacy problem in Latin America until we develop the U.S. domestic aspect of the President's international education program, although I am all for that.

The Senator mentioned universities and intelligence agencies in a section of his speech. It so happens that last week, at Wayne State University, I spoke at an institute sponsored by four universities. But those who came to the institute came from all over the United States. The president of the institute is Prof. John Gange of the University of Oregon. It is a large group of political scientists.

I was asked to lecture on the very subject matter that the Senator from New York has covered in this part of his speech dealing with universities and intelligence agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the lecture that I gave at Wayne University on the night of May 5, in which lecture I discussed the subject that the Senator from New York has raised in his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. I said in the first paragraph of the lecture:

It has been suggested that I talk to this meeting on the subject of the gap between academic research and foreign policy. But at the risk of being topical and taking a short-term view, I would rather talk about a factor in this relationship which worries me much more. It is the extent to which academic research and opinions about foreign policy are polluted by Government sponsorship.

I discussed Camelot in the lecture. I discussed the situation that had developed at MIT, and in that respect I pointed out that in the late fifties our subcommittee—and President Kennedy was then a Senator from Massachusetts on my subcommittee—\$150,000 had been appropriated by the Senate for the subcommittee to make a study of United States-Latin American relations growing out of unfavorable incidents in Latin America.

Similarly the full committee had undertaken a study of the foreign aid program, using the same system of contracting to many academic individuals and institutes.

The first proposal of the Senate was that there be an investigation of our Latin American policy in 1958. I asked that it be changed to a study instead of an investigation. I then moved in the committee that the \$150,000, or most of it, be used to enter into contracts with universities, research foundations, and centers of recognized authorities on Latin America to have them prepare for us a series of monographs that would be helpful to use to set forth the findings of fact and the recommendations as to what Congress and the administration should do in regard to possible changes in foreign policy.

The then Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts seconded my motion and made a strong supporting speech urging its adoption. The Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously adopted the procedural recommendations.

It was out of those studies and recommendations—as President Kennedy told me on several occasions that he took them to the White House when he went there—that he went to work and formulated the great Kennedy Alliance for Progress program.

One of those studies for the full Committee on Foreign Aid was prepared by MIT. I want to say on the floor of the Senate today that it was a good study. It was prepared by men at MIT who were competent to prepare it. But as I pointed out in my lecture the other night at Wayne University, we did not know that the division of MIT that conducted the study came into creation under a CIA grant. We do not know today how many more of the studies on foreign aid and Latin America were done by academic or private agencies subsidized by CIA, AID, and the Defense Department.

I do not think, at least when the contracts are let as we let that contract, that such an obvious fact should be kept from us.

I pointed out in the lecture that as a result of what has really developed now, not only in the academic world but also outside of the academic world, we should let the reader beware, let the public beware, let Congress beware, and let all of us beware of these studies that are recommended out of the universities unless we know where the funds come from to finance the center or the professor making the study.

I do not think that Congress should continue to support the CIA, and I said in my lecture, the Defense Department and also the State Department, in financing, undisclosed to the people and to the country, these so-called academic research studies because they make them suspect, and they are bound to be suspect.

The Senator from New York said that he would give some thought as to how this type of work should be done, and I am all for that. The Senator suggested the State Department—and that may be most appropriate—in reply to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], stating also that he had given some thought to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That should be studied further. But I think there is another suggestion, to which I have been giving a considerable amount of thought, that needs to be considered. I am not so sure that we should not set up a national foundation of international research study somewhat in the format of a National Science Foundation, and we have a whole series of Federal foundations.

I am not so sure, in order to guarantee their independence, to guarantee their objectivity, to free them from any suspicion that they may be connected with the CIA or the Defense Department or the State Department, and therefore their point of view may not be completely objective, but that we ought to have an independent foundation to conduct what should be independent studies. But I have reached no final conclusion about it. I am happy that the Senator from New York spoke out on this matter, because he knows, as I know, that the

academic world is greatly disturbed. I wish he could have seen the reaction I received from outstanding scholars in this country following my lecture the other night, when they came up and said they were sure I had no idea of the great controversy going on within the academic world today because of the views held by many about these federally financed research studies, whether by the American University in this city, or Michigan State University, or Massachusetts Institute of Technology—which, as the Senator mentioned, has now discontinued its past relationships with CIA because of the criticism it was arousing. They said, "If you knew how we really feel, you will know how welcome your remarks were here tonight. The Federal Government ought to follow a procedural course of action that will take America's universities out of the realm of the suspect."

And they are suspect today. We have a right, now, when we receive a report from any American university relating in any way to the American military or the American foreign policy, to ask the simple questions, "Who finances your center or program? What were your instructions? What review was your report subject to?"

As an old academic man myself, I commend the Senator from New York on what he has said on that subject, because I am sure he will find that that part of his speech will exercise a terrific impact on American academic life.

One further word. I wish to say that at the beginning, it was never contemplated that the Alliance for Progress program should be a military aid program. The military aspects of our aid to Latin America were never intended, in the first place, to be encompassed in the Alliance for Progress program. I think that is very important, and I stress it again today.

Yes, a certain amount of military aid will be needed. But we have too many leaders in some Latin American countries who seem to think the greatest weapon we can send them for meeting the challenge of communism is military aid. It is my opinion that the military aid we have sent them has, in many instances, played into the hands of the Communist threat in Latin America, rather than tending to subdue it.

Whatever the views of others may be, I only wish to say, as I close, what I said at the beginning: the Senator has made a speech this afternoon which updates the Alliance for Progress. It is a most appropriate speech to be read in connection with the last speech on the subject made by President Kennedy, and I hope all Members of Congress and officials in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the CIA, as well as the leaders of the Latin American countries, will read the Senator's speech, contemplate it, and comprehend it; and then see what can be done to carry out the great idealism it expresses.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] spoke of idealism as being pragmatic. I know of nothing that is more pragmatic than an ideal put to work. That is all the Senator has asked for in

his speech. We have some great ideals in this country in the field of foreign policy. However, of late we seem to have given them an opiate; they are not alive, not vigorous. They are asleep. I hope the Senator's speech will serve to awaken some of them, because that is what I interpret its purpose to be.

EXHIBIT 1

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 5, 1966

It has been suggested that I talk to this meeting on the subject of the gap between academic research and foreign policy. But at the risk of being topical and taking a short-term view, I would rather talk about a factor in this relationship which worries me much more. It is the extent to which academic research and opinions about foreign policy are polluted by Government sponsorship.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recently concluded a series of hearings on the Vietnam war and China policy in an unprecedented effort to ventilate ideas and opinions that will go beyond official policy on these subjects. It was especially true in the case of China that we relied heavily upon academicians, since the absence of trade, cultural, tourist, and political relations narrowly confines the extent of public knowledge and expertise about mainland China.

No State Department or other Government witnesses appeared, primarily because they declined to appear in public session. But even so, it soon became evident that much of the institutional work on Chinese and Asian affairs is sponsored or subsidized to some degree or other by the foreign policy agencies of the Federal Government. The Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and its foreign aid agency, and the Department of Defense spend tens of millions each year for academic research. Beyond that, we have encountered the problem of professors who appreciate—as do you—that expert knowledge of foreign policy requires a familiarity that often must be obtained by working for a foreign policy agency if not full time, then at least as a consultant.

The influence of present or potential contracts, and of present or potential "consultantships" is one of the problems that will grow as academicians are brought into foreign policy formulation. It will grow for the Congress and the public, too, as we seek judgments of international affairs that will be unencumbered by association with the agency that devised the policy under review.

PROBLEM OF INDEPENDENT FOREIGN POLICY OPINIONS

I would like to take you to a few examples of the difficulty this relationship poses for some of us in the Senate. The Foreign Relations Committee has a special responsibility, in my opinion, not only to consider the evidence and testimony presented to us by the Department of State, but to consider also the shortcomings in a given policy. In the latter 1950's, we undertook one review of the foreign aid program by contracting with several universities and private consulting agencies to survey various aspects of foreign aid. The Latin American Subcommittee, of which I am chairman and was then, did the same for Latin American policy.

The role of private enterprise in aid, aid activities of other free nations, and of the Communist bloc, the objectives of U.S. economic assistance, and our military assistance program were among the subject matter surveyed in the foreign aid study. Commodity problems in Latin America, problems of Latin American economic development, and Soviet

bloc activities in Latin America were among the topics surveyed by contract for my subcommittee.

We know now, but did not know then, that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, which received one of these contracts, had been founded a few years before primarily through a CIA grant. The MIT Center did the survey of the economic objectives of foreign aid. I was reminded of this study just a few days ago, when the CIA man in charge of the Michigan State project was quoted as saying "there is nothing sinister in using foreign aid as a CIA cover nor in using universities as CIA covers." We still do not know how many other of our contractors received financial support from CIA, DOD, or other Federal agencies in the foreign policy field.

This week, MIT announced that it would drop its CIA contracts. According to its director, Max Millikan, its contracts related to research on Communism and China. The amount of cash represented by current CIA contracts for the MIT Center is classified.

I may say that if we on the committee were gullible then, we are not so gullible now. During the China hearings, it became the practice to ask each witness the extent of his personal relations with Government agencies, and the extent to which his institution was subsidized by Government agencies. As Senator FULBRIGHT put it to one: "I am trying to find out how independent a witness you are."

This particular witness was both a university faculty member and a leading analyst for a Washington institute financed almost entirely by the Defense Department. Indeed, one man who has been in and out of the Defense Department, the academic world, and private institutes, explains that the relationship is so incestuous that it scarcely matters which payroll he is on.

MICHIGAN STATE AND VIETNAM

By far the most dramatic of these episodes has been the Michigan State adventure in South Vietnam. I will not go into the facts of that project, which are now widely known. But it is a matter of increasing concern that the Michigan State administrators seem to view the role of their Center for International Programs not as an educational program but as an operations arm of national foreign policy agencies. The coordinator of the MSU Vietnam project, Stanley Sheinbaum, who caused the facts of that project to be published, draws a conclusion from them that must be considered, whether his discretion of what transpired is questioned or not. He states:

"The Michigan State professors performed at all levels. They advised on fingerprinting techniques, on bookkeeping, on governmental budgeting and on the very writing of South Vietnam's constitution. One was even instrumental in the choice of the President of South Vietnam. But in all this they never questioned U.S. foreign policy which had placed them there and which, thereby, they were supporting.

"The following article on MSU's involvement in Vietnam is merely a case study of two critical failures in American education and intellectual life today. The first and more obvious is the diversion of the university away from its functions and duties of scholarship and teaching. The second has to do with the failure of the academic intellectual to serve as critic, conscience, ombudsman. Especially in foreign policy, which henceforth will bear heavily on our very way of life at home, is this failure serious.

"For this failure has left us in a state of drift. We lack historical perspective. We have been conditioned by our social science training not to ask the normative question; we possess neither the inclination nor the means with which to question and judge our foreign policy. We have only the capacity to

be experts and technicians to serve that policy. This is the tragedy of the Michigan State professors; we were all automatic cold warriors.

"On every campus from Harvard to Michigan State, the story is the same. The social science professor, trained (not educated) to avoid the bigger problems, is off campus expertising for his Government or industry client whose assumptions he readily adopts. Where is the source of serious intellectual criticism that would help us avoid future Vietnams? Serious ideological controversy is dead and with it the perspective for judgment."

I hope that Mr. Sheinbaum is wrong in saying that controversy is dead. The teach-in movement last year on many campuses—which I encouraged and in which I participated on several campuses including the University of Oregon—encourages me to think it is not dead. The teach-in a year ago at Rutgers was reported in the campus newspaper with an outpouring of enthusiasm, not so much for what was said as for the all-night faculty-student intellectual free-for-all which led one student to say of it: "This was the first time I felt that I knew what a real university is."

But there is a price for independence. In the period of 1959, 1960, and 1961, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University both received foreign aid contracts in Asian countries. It was given to the University of Oregon to advise on economic planning by South Korea, and to Oregon State to advise on agricultural education techniques in Thailand. Both groups were highly critical of the performance of the local government, and of AID for extending aid, anyway. "Political reasons" were overriding. The contracts were not renewed, for AID does not care to employ persistent critics any more than anyone else does. But it was the findings of these two schools with which I have close ties that prompted me to begin looking into aspects of foreign aid that I had not previously considered.

Perhaps my personal reaction was the only result of these contracts at the time. But I am only now beginning to feel that the whole question of employing academicians for this job deserves rethinking. How many university groups sacrifice their contracts for these intellectual conclusions and how many become the action arm for the program in order to sustain the contract?

ACADEMIC RESEARCH ABROAD

Another example that aroused many of us on the Foreign Relations Committee last year was the Camelot episode. It was not until local repercussions in Chile had come to the attention of the American Ambassador that we knew American University was under contract to the Department of the Army to study social conditions in Chile that might lead to unstable political conditions. In layman's language, the purpose of Project Camelot and others like it is to survey a country to get a line on its potential for revolution, and how it can be headed off or countered. Last summer we were given to understand that between 40 and 50 of these studies in foreign countries were being financed by the military agencies.

Camelot was canceled, and an agreement was entered into between the State and Defense Departments that henceforth the studies would proceed only upon the approval of the State Department.

But the Special Operations Research Office at American University continues for this purpose. Its Director described its purpose as: "the relationships with the peoples of the developing countries and deals with problems of aiding in the orderly process of social change and national development which is of concern to the U.S. Military Establishment."

For studying the "orderly process of social change and national development which is of concern to the U.S. Military Establishment" the Army budgeted \$2,463,000 to the Special Operations Research Office in fiscal year 1966. In both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic the orderly process of social change and national development has required large numbers of U.S. troops, for it is the Military Establishment's idea of what is orderly that is coming to dominate American foreign policy in the undeveloped parts of the world.

And for this the academic world is being drawn in not to advise but to implement. The entire Defense Department budget for research on behavioral and social sciences came to nearly \$23 million in fiscal year 1966. The CIA budget is classified. But these sums cannot help but raise the question of the independence of the results they produce.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

It is into this picture that the administration has brought its proposal for a new International Education Act, and to discuss this aspect of academic research and foreign policy I shall put on my hat as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, to which the bill was referred.

Its short title is: "To provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research."

The purpose of the bill is to provide Federal assistance to institutions of higher education to strengthen their international studies programs at the graduate level. The bill carries no specific amount for this purpose, but we are told that about \$10 million a year is expected to be spent under it.

The objective is laudatory. But will the results be laudatory? That is the question we are going into in our subcommittee when we take up this bill. Does it mean that another \$10 million will be added to the existing funds for Defense and CIA research? Does putting the Office of Education in charge of allocating the money mean the centers so financed will remain reasonably pure in their research activities? Or does the permission contained in the bill to "utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government" mean that the graduate centers so aided will merely become another front for the CIA and the DOD?

There are some of us who feel that aid to education through the Office of Education, as distinct from a grant or contract for a specific purpose from the Defense Department, AID, or CIA, may be sufficiently divorced from special purposes and sufficiently free from ties to a particular policy to be worthwhile. But the bill will have to be much more carefully drafted than it is now if that result from it is to be achieved.

These remarks admittedly have dwelt on the dangers of directly subsidized academic work in foreign policy. They have not gone into the virtues of such subsidies, and I think there may be some in that public knowledge in these fields is advanced. I hope I have not left you with the idea that I have no confidence at all in the intellectual freedom of the academic world, for I continue to regard it as one of the central and stalwart elements in the checks and balances of our free society.

What I would like to emphasize above all is the problem of public knowledge of the source of these Federal funds, and the purpose for which they were advanced. It is the acceptance of published findings and opinions by a people—and a Congress—unaware of their financial backing that I feel constitutes the danger to foreign policy formulation. And it is an emphasis and preoccupation with operations rather than scholarship and teaching that constitutes

the danger to our educational institutions from extensive governmental support.

Acknowledgment of sources, however, raises questions beyond those of financial support. Last week, Senator FULBRIGHT called to public attention the leading article in the Nation's most respected foreign policy publication, the *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, which argued that the Vietcong should not be included in any negotiations in Vietnam because it is a Communist front for Hanoi. The author was described by Foreign Affairs as a "student of Asia." I wonder how many of you here who are students of Asia, as I am, could publish in *Foreign Affairs* on that basis. But this particular student of Asia, George Carver, Jr., is also a leading Vietnam expert of the Central Intelligence Agency, a part of his qualifications that was not mentioned by *Foreign Affairs*.

In his letter to the Central Intelligence Agency, Senator FULBRIGHT raised on behalf of the committee the following issues as to the role of Agency employees in engaging in activities designed to influence foreign policy attitudes in the United States: "Was Mr. Carver encouraged by the Agency to write this article? Did the author use information available to him only by reason of his employment? Did the Agency approve the article? Would the Agency have approved the article if it had been critical of administration policy? Would their employee have been free to write a critical article for publication; and why was his official connection with the Government not made public? How many other Agency employees have written articles in their field of interest for publication in the United States without attribution? How is this kind of activity related to the role of the Agency as an information gathering institution?"

The CIA's explanation was that Foreign Affairs requested the article. But it had nothing to say about the implication that the public was exposed to a vital argument of American policy without knowing who was really responsible for it.

What is coming out of all this is a growing attitude of "Let the reader beware." Let the public beware, let the Congress beware, that anything it reads these days is reasonably free from the intellectual baggage of direct self-interest.

These are some of the doubts that I must express to you on the subject of academic research and foreign policy. I have not resolved them at all, and in fact, have probably not thought them through, from the standpoint of foreign policy formulation.

From the standpoint of higher education, I do believe that the desire of educational institutions to become operating arms of foreign policy is leading to bad practices and bad results. That may be foreign policy, but it is not education.

I would like to see the academic community survey this subject itself. I would like to hear the pros and cons of the criticisms I have made. I would like to feel that there is some recognition within the academic social sciences of the dangers involved in Federal financing, and that perhaps some self-policing is in order.

The "credibility gap" between Government and governed is already wider than is safe for our free institutions. More than any others, the academic community should be on guard against this gap because the efficacy of intellectual freedom requires not only a speaker but a listener. The audience of the academic community consists of the student and the public. To the extent that either audience becomes cynical and unbelieving, academic research will lose its impact on the formulation of foreign policy.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Oregon. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, he has had much ex-

perience in such matters, and I particularly appreciate his remarks concerning the history of that subcommittee, and the service thereon of Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, which ultimately led to the Alliance for Progress program, and how, as a result of the interest thus created in his mind, much progress later resulted. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. I commend the Senator from New York, not only for what he has said today, but also for having taken the time to visit in Latin America during the recess and talk with students, men on the street, and people in government there, thus creating a good impression for the United States, and helping persuade the people of Latin America to believe that we, as a people, are interested in Latin America.

I have hurriedly read the speech just delivered by the Senator from New York, and I must say in all candor that it is a great speech. It contains many suggestions which, if adopted, will constitute guidelines for a proper blueprint for dealing with Latin America in the future.

Lately, because we have been busy with the Vietnam war, we have not done enough to create and keep open lines of communication between our country and Latin America. And somehow, we have been led to believe that the Yankee dollar is an adequate means of communication. I think history has proved that the Yankee dollar is no such thing. We need people-to-people communication.

Many reforms are needed in Latin America to improve its standards of living. For instance, let us take the case of Mexico. Mexico has made great strides, but it tackled the problems of education and the problems of distribution of land on a parallel basis; and thus Mexico has been able to upgrade the living standard of these people, and they have progressed.

Mexico, furthermore, knows how to deal with the Communist problem, and has dealt with it successfully, in spite of the fact that recently there was an uprising at the University of Mexico.

I say to the Senator from New York that as a result of my visits to Latin America, I have concluded that something which is very important to creating a good image for the United States there is the image of our President. I recall the image that President Roosevelt created in Latin America. That image was transferred to the people of the United States. Then I recall the declaration of President Kennedy on the Alliance for Progress. The people of Latin America revered him, and still do. That reverence has been a carryover from his declaration.

I am anxious, as I know the Senator from New York is anxious, that our country do something affirmatively other than passing out dollars through the Alliance for Progress. Many things need to be done in education, in agrarian reform, in agricultural research, and in communication. I think the Senator will agree

with me that in traveling through Latin America, if one visits the bookstores, one can find many books that have been placed there, at a very minimal cost, by the agents of Peking or Moscow. The United States has made very few books available to those bookstores, or even the libraries in Latin America. We do have a publishing house in Mexico City, but I do not believe that we are publishing enough books, nor making them available at low cost throughout Latin America, so that people there may learn about our country, and may understand that our motive is to improve the lot of our neighbors, and not to enrich ourselves through the process.

I commend the Senator from New York for his splendid statement and the great contribution he has made in this particular field.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his remarks, and also for pointing out a very important matter which deals with the field of communications and our ability to talk and work with the peoples of Latin America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret very much that I was called from the Chamber at a time when the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] was completing his remarks and I did not get back until he had concluded.

I should like to express my complete endorsement of the carefully documented survey the Senator from New York has made of the situation in Latin America. The Senator's keen powers of analysis are evident throughout this survey, which was based upon his trip through Latin America last fall during which he talked with a great number of individuals in places of leadership in Latin America.

I share his views as to the necessity for a massive program of land reform and education, if the objectives of the Alliance for Progress are to be achieved.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that there is no real justification for further military aid to the nations of Latin America, but that there is a great need for further economic, social, and technical aid.

The Senator from New York, I understand, will complete his remarks tomorrow, at which time he will discuss the programs of economic assistance. For the moment, I should like to reiterate the point which I have already made in the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to the utter inadequacy of the foreign aid bill which it is now considering. I hope to be in the Chamber tomorrow when the Senator from New York makes his comments as to the need for additional economic aid.

To my way of thinking, the American people have got themselves in to a cul de

sac with respect to foreign aid. Our neighbors overseas have no domestic constituencies. It is not popular in Pennsylvania, in Alaska, in Florida, or in Maine, to advocate taking taxpayers' dollars and spending them for social and economic purposes overseas. Yet the rich nations are getting richer every year, and the poor nations are getting poorer every year. In terms of, first, a sense of compassion and, second, in terms of a sense of enlightened self-interest, I am strongly of the view that the richest nation the world has ever known is acting in a niggardly, uncompassionate, and unenlightened way in cutting down, year after year, the amount that it is spending on foreign aid, not only in gross terms, but also in terms of a percentage of the gross national product.

I am utterly unable to understand why the Congress in general, and the Senate in particular, and the President—influenced no doubt by the political difficulties of passing through Congress an adequate authorization or an adequate appropriation for foreign aid—should have been unwilling to respond to this moral, to this social, to this economic challenge—and, indeed, I say again, to this challenge of self-interest.

For the time will come, if we constantly cut down on our commitments toward land reform, toward education, toward economic improvement of the underdeveloped countries—and I speak not only of Latin America, but also of the countries of Asia and Africa—when the United States will have precious few friends left in the world. In fact, if I may say so, for a variety of reasons we are well on our way to that unfortunate situation right now.

In my judgment, what is needed more than anything else is an intensification of the education of the American people and of Congress to the vital necessity for expanding the extent of our contributions to the underdeveloped countries of the world—contributions of an economic and social nature.

I share to the highest degree the views of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who believes that to the maximum extent feasible foreign assistance should be multilateral, that is, it should be extended through international institutions, and not bilateral in terms of agreements between ourselves and particular countries.

Nevertheless, as a pragmatic matter, it must be clear that we have been quite unable to persuade the other relatively well-to-do nations of the world to bear their share of the burden.

I wish that it were otherwise. I would hope that we would be able to make our contribution through IDA, through the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, through the Inter-American Bank, and through the newly established Asian Bank.

As Senator FULBRIGHT has well said, "You never see signs on walls saying 'World Bank go home'."

For that reason I share his views on the desirability of making as much of our aid as possible multilateral. But in some way, in some manner, this aid must go to those countries before it is too late,

and they become places where there are heard curses not loud but deep, while the most opulent, affluent, and compassionate nation the world has ever known turns its back on its obligations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCATION OF 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for two decades the United States has led the world in the science of nuclear energy. We have pioneered in the peaceful uses of the atom. We have taken the lead in urging the world to adopt international measures against the spread and use of nuclear weapons.

We are now getting ready to build a 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, the world's biggest atom smasher. It will be a vital tool for our understanding of nuclear matter. It will help keep the United States ahead in the nuclear science race.

We are going to build it. The question is where?

During the past year we have trusted the Atomic Energy Commission with the job of answering this question.

When the Commission asked for site proposals last year, communities all over the Nation responded with suggestions for 200 sites in 46 States.

Mr. President, never before in the history of Federal construction programs has the Government had so many offers, so many sites to choose from.

But Mr. President, something has gone wrong. What began as a search for the best site has turned out to be a miserable deception.

The National Academy of Sciences has interfered and the good faith of all those who submitted site proposals has been violated.

From my State there were four proposals for sites in Kansas City, Joplin, St. Louis, and Flat River. The first three were among the final 85 reviewed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences. While all four were rejected, let no one misunderstand me. Of course, I was disappointed. Of course, I thought the proposals from my State were outstanding and deserved to be among the final six. Many Missourians made a tremendous effort to win this accelerator, and share the concern I am expressing today. But the deception I am talking about affects the whole Nation. It affects the future of our high energy research program. It affects our success in the nuclear energy race.

Mr. President, I am bringing this whole matter before the Senate today because I think the American people have a right to know what happened. They should know the facts and Congress should know the facts.

Before the end of this session the Atomic Energy Commission is going to be asking Congress to approve a site for the new accelerator. And they are going to ask us to authorize construction costs totaling \$375 million. I think it would be a great tragedy, a great setback in our nuclear programs if the Commission proceeds to choose from a list of sites which fail to meet the basic

physical requirements which the Commission itself set forth last year.

When the Commission asked for proposals, they issued official criteria on which these proposals should be based. These criteria were submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and are printed in the committee's hearings. These criteria were given to all the communities where proposals were being drawn up. These criteria were given to the press and have appeared in whole or in part in papers and magazines all across the country. I have a copy right here in my hand and I am going to put it in the RECORD where everybody can see it once again.

Mr. President, every proposal submitted to the Commission was based on these criteria. Organizations and local governments spent hundreds of hours and thousands of dollars measuring themselves against these criteria.

Every proposal was submitted in the belief that the best man will win. But thanks to interference by the National Academy of Sciences, the best man has about as much chance of winning as the North Pole has of melting before tomorrow morning.

What a shame it is that the Atomic Energy Committee turned the site evaluation over to the National Academy of Sciences. For no sooner had the National Academy taken over, than it adopted an entirely new criterion for judging the sites. The Academy admits this on page 7 of its 44-page report. And, as if this were not enough, the Academy report firmly states they "assigned paramount importance to this new criterion."

This is an alarming development. By refusing to stick to the original AEC criteria, by changing horses in the middle of the stream, the Academy has picked six seriously inadequate sites. They have recommended to the AEC six sites—Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Denver, Madison, and Sacramento—of which not a single one satisfies more than five of the eight major AEC criteria. Three of the six recommended sites fail to meet half of the eight major criteria.

If you ask the National Academy why they did this they will tell you they are "assured that the sites have suitable physical properties." This is the way the report puts it.

But when you sit down and read this report you find plenty of evidence that they were not sure—not sure about the sites they are choosing, not sure whether the sites live up to the basic requirements of the accelerator.

On the matter of electric power, the AEC set forth clear and vital requirements. This instrument will take tremendous amounts of electrical power. The proposed power supply, for instance, must have at least 10 times the capacity needed by the accelerator. Yet the Academy states "a detailed study would be needed" to determine if they could ever get adequate power at the Denver and Madison sites. At present the power supply at both sites is hopelessly inadequate.

The Academy is willing to take a costly gamble on two sites which fail to meet

minimum standards. Yet the Academy rejected many other sites with plenty of electric power to offer.

What made the Academy think it could ignore a vital factor like power?

When the Atomic Energy Commission first asked for proposals they stressed the importance of proximity to a major airport having frequent service to major U.S. cities. That is actually one of the criteria.

But what did the National Academy come up with?

They came up with Sacramento, Calif., which does not have a major airport and is 2½ hours driving time from the San Francisco airport. They came up with Madison, Wis., which the report actually admits "offers only limited direct airline service to major cities except for Chicago."

And, as if that were not enough, they came up with Brookhaven which is 1½ hours from a major airport.

Now, the Atomic Energy Commission has told us all along that there will be teams of scientists flying to and from the site each day. The report itself even states that most of the research at the accelerator will be carried out by visiting scientists.

But for some reason, the Academy insists on recommending three sites which are painfully hard to get to—sites which will increase travel time and cause the waste of thousands of valuable man-hours through delay and gross inconvenience.

Mr. President, anyone who reads the Academy's report will see immediately that the Academy had very little concern about construction costs. In fact, on page 3 of the report they state:

It has not been the purpose of this committee to estimate the costs of construction and operation at various sites.

Well, now, I wish the Academy would tell us who is looking at the construction costs? Who is trying to find a site where the American taxpayer will not be burdened by unnecessary expenses?

At Ann Arbor the report states:

The bedrock is reported to vary from 200 to 300 feet. * * * Deep foundations such as piles will be required for support of the magnet ring and in critical experimental areas.

At Brookhaven, we find the proposed site is located on a "glacial outwash plain, underlain primarily by sands and gravels to the depth of nearly 200 feet." At Denver we find the report stating:

The terrain is rolling and considerable excavation will be required.

At Sacramento, there is little, if any, excavation material above bedrock and thus the excavation for the instrument would require blasting. The report admits that in the case of Sacramento "the principal drawback in the site is the shortage of soil materials in the vicinity that could be used for shielding."

The original criteria set forth by the Atomic Energy Commission did not include climate. But in November, the Commission submitted to the National Academy a revised criteria list. This new list did specifically include climate.

The Commission and the Academy agreed: below-freezing weather could

"increase costs and decrease efficiency in the experimental areas during the severe part of the winter."

In fact, Mr. President severe weather would mean a loss in operating costs of \$1 million per week based on the \$60 million annual operating budget.

Yet, in spite of this warning, which site did the Academy pick?

They picked Denver and Madison which both have more than 160 days a year with below-freezing weather. On top of that, Denver has an average of some 59 inches of snowfall every year—snowfall which brings traffic in the area to a complete standstill.

Mr. President, it does not take a construction engineer to realize that at these sites there will be added cost for the American taxpayer.

The Academy said it was not very concerned with construction costs.

Why did not the Atomic Energy Commission reprimand the Academy for this attitude? After all, the Atomic Energy Commission had given its word to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They had given their word to the Congress. And they had given their word to hundreds of Americans drawing up site proposals.

Mr. President, I submit that unless this whole massive deception, this violation of good faith, is corrected immediately the American taxpayer is going to be asked to pay millions of extra dollars for construction, with the possibility of delay in getting the accelerator built, and extreme inconvenience for thousands of scientists and technicians who will use the accelerator when it is completed.

Mr. President, the more I read the National Academy report and the more I review what has been said by the Atomic Energy Commission, the more alarmed I become.

What we expected the Academy to do was to select a site that is physically ideal for the construction of the accelerator.

But the Academy refused. They refused to recognize that the American people expect economy from their Government.

And instead, they substituted a subjective criterion which holds about as much water as a fisherman's net.

The Academy says that it placed "paramount important to the considerations that affect the recruiting of personnel."

Fantastic as it seems, the Academy actually believes that unless they build this accelerator in one of these six sites, they will not be able to attract the scientists and engineers needed for construction and operation.

Can anyone imagine that a scientist would refuse to work at the most important research installation in his field just because it is not at Denver, Madison, Sacramento, Chicago, Ann Arbor, or Brookhaven?

The Academy says, "Oh, but Senator, the scientists would like to live in Denver and they already live near the other sites. If we put it where there are no high energy physicists, or if we put it where there is no fabulous recreation attraction, these men and women will not come."

What if we find some who like water skiing instead of snow skiing, or quail hunting instead of duck hunting?

They might as well tell me our scientists have suddenly gone soft, that they are no longer the great Americans you and I know them to be.

It was the Atomic Energy Commission that built the Los Alamos weapons research laboratory. Did they have any trouble attracting scientists to go out there?

It was the Atomic Energy Commission which built the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. Do they now propose moving Oak Ridge up to Denver or Brookhaven or Madison or Sacramento because the scientists prefer not to move to Oak Ridge?

Mr. President, I submit that scientists will go to the Arctic, the equator, or anywhere on earth if it is necessary to pursue their research. Yet today, no one is asking our high energy physicists to go anywhere like the Arctic or the equator. All we are asking is that they go to a site where the accelerator will be the least burden to the American taxpayer and a site which will provide the maximum benefit for the whole Nation.

Mr. President, this is not the only speech I will make on this subject. I can promise the Senate that I will attempt to bring to the public's attention all of the facts on this matter. The Congress and the public must know. They have a right to know.

When all the questions and facts are laid before this body, I hope the Atomic Energy Commission will reject the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences.

And do not let the AEC tell us they are bound to accept the recommendations of the National Academy. They are bound only to be accountable to the people. They are bound to follow the directions of the President and the Congress. The sooner they understand that, the better off they will be.

I think it is in the national interest that the AEC make a complete review of all the proposed sites, not just the six that the National Academy selected. Without such a review I am convinced that great damage will be done to our nuclear research program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document entitled "Considerations Involved in Siting a Major New Accelerator."

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN SITING A MAJOR NEW ACCELERATOR¹

1. GENERAL

A national laboratory having as its principal research instrument a 200- to 300-billion-electron-volt accelerator will have a staff of approximately 2,000 people. The resident staff will include professional scientists and engineers who will be responsible for the

¹ Submitted by Commissioner G. F. Tape to Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, on Apr. 1, 1965. Also appeared in AEC press release dated Apr. 28, 1965.

design, construction, and operation of the accelerator and its associated facilities, and research scientists whose principal function will be carrying out the long term research program in collaboration with visiting scientists, particularly from university users groups. The site must be so located that management can mobilize and maintain the necessary specialized staff, both resident and nonresident, to accomplish effectively the goals of the research project.

It is difficult to establish priorities or weights among the various technical, economic, and social criteria that can be described. Some items, of course, are absolutely essential such as acreage requirements, the availability of adequate power, the proximity of adequate transportation, etc. On the other hand, other items such as foundation requirements of deep piles versus shallow piles, one-pass versus recirculating water systems, tunneling versus cutting and filling for shielding the magnet ring, etc., cannot be categorized absolutely and are subject to some compromise in order to maximize the potential of each site.

In other words, there will be trade-offs between the technical and other factors in order that overall efficiencies and economies can be obtained.

2. LAND

(a) Sufficient acreage, in the continental United States, should be available to meet both initial and long range expansion requirements (depending upon shape and topography, 3,000 acres is tentatively estimated as minimum for a 200-Bev. proton accelerator).

(b) The land should be owned or be reasonably available to the Federal Government.

(c) The terrain and substructure should have load-bearing capacity adequate to insure stable foundations for both the accelerator and the other associated facilities.

(d) The site should be reasonably level to minimize expensive excavations.

(e) Sites with serious seismic activity, faults or loose joints in bedrock are to be avoided; however, it is unlikely that many sites will be eliminated solely on this basis.

3. UTILITIES

(a) The ready availability of electric power at the site sufficient for a demand load of several hundred megawatts is required.

(b) The ready availability at the site of an adequate supply of cool, clean water is desirable. Since closed recirculating water systems can be used and may be preferable technically, it is unlikely that many sites will be eliminated solely on this basis.

(c) The economics of power and water acquisition and especially subsequent operational costs will be a factor.

4. ENVIRONMENT

(a) Proximity to a major airport having frequent service to major U.S. cities is necessary to provide easy access and minimum travel time for university users and other visiting research personnel.

(b) Adequate surface transportation facilities are necessary for movement of goods and transport of personnel.

(c) Proximity to a commercial industrial center which includes adequate coverage of special needs in electronics, electrical and precision mechanical equipment will ease problems of recruiting technical support and in obtaining specialized supplies.

(d) Proximity to other broadly based research and development activities will provide opportunities for desirable interaction of scientific and engineering personnel.

(e) Sufficient housing and community facilities must be available to accommodate the permanent operating and research staff of several thousand people and the transient staff of several hundred.

(f) Proximity to a cultural center that includes a large university will provide intellectual and cultural opportunities attractive for staff and families.

(g) Regional wage and cost variations as well as labor surplus areas are factors.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document setting forth eight major considerations, entitled "200-Billion-Electron-Volt Accelerator Laboratory Siting Factors."

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR LABORATORY SITING FACTORS

The evaluation factors for siting the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator as originally submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are recast and further highlighted in this document in order that the Commission be able to make a final selection.

The principal objective in the factors governing the choice of a site is the contribution to the capability and effectiveness of the Nation's research in elementary particle physics. The site must be so located that management can mobilize and maintain the necessary specialized staff, both resident and nonresident to accomplish the research goals.

The siting factors have been categorized as follows:

- I. Land suitability.
- II. Utility availability.
- III. Construction cost.
- IV. Operation cost.
- V. Transportation.
- VI. Colleges and universities.
- VII. Communities.
- VIII. Other considerations.

I. LAND SUITABILITY

(A) Sufficient acreage, in the continental United States, should be available to meet both initial and long-range expansion requirements. Depending upon shape and topography, 3,000 acres is estimated as minimum for a 200-billion-electron-volt proton accelerator. Availability of additional land contiguous to the site described should be considered.

(B) The land configuration and dimensions should be capable of accommodating the accelerator and associated facilities. One and one-quarter miles is taken as the least linear dimensions with acceptable topography.

(C) The land should be owned by or be reasonably available to the Federal Government. Cost of the non-Federal land should be considered.

(D) Compatibility of present use of the land and of the existing capital improvements with an accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(E) The site should be reasonably level to minimize expensive excavations. The maximum elevation differential should be no more than 100 feet.

(F) The surface and subsurface soils should have load-bearing capacity adequate to insure stable foundations for both the accelerator and the associated facilities.

II. UTILITY AVAILABILITY

(A) Distance of power from site and the ready availability of electric power at the site must be sufficient for a demand load of 200 megawatts initially and increasing gradually to 300 megawatts.

(B) Impact on the electrical distribution system as it affects the availability of electrical power in the quantities necessary for efficient operation of the accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(C) The need for reliability of electrical power requires that the power source be an interconnected system.

(D) The ready availability at the site of cool, clean water should be considered. The initial minimum usage rate is estimated to be 2,000 gallons per minute, assuming the use of a recirculating system. Eventually the water requirements will be 4,000 gallons per minute.

(E) Natural hazards, including seismic, hurricane, tornado, snow, rain, temperature, winds and dust affects construction costs. Natural hazards bear upon construction costs by way of affecting problems of stability as well as insulation and covering construction costs.

III. CONSTRUCTION COST

(A) The effect upon construction costs due to existing facilities such as buildings, utilities, and roads should be considered. The utility of existing site facilities should be gaged in relation to the new laboratory to assess construction cost savings.

(B) Soil movement and load-bearing capacity affects accelerator associated construction costs. The requirements of accelerator stability must be accounted for in addition to the conventional construction requirements.

(C) Elevation differential affects construction cost. The elements involved are the relative costs of cutting and filling, as well as the effects of elevation differentials on earth stability which in turn affects construction cost.

(D) Tunneling cost advantage over cutting and filling, if any, should be considered.

(E) Cost to cope with elevation of water table should be considered. The variation of level and variation with time of the water table affects earth stability and is to be associated with drainage construction costs.

(F) Cost to bring electric power to the site should be considered.

(G) Cost to bring water to the site should be considered.

(H) Regional wage and cost variations as estimated by construction cost type indices should be considered.

(I) Depth of bedrock as it affects the stability of the accelerator and the associated facilities should be considered.

(J) Depth and variation in level of the water table as it affects earth stability in the vicinity of the accelerator should be considered.

(K) Seismic activity as it affects the strength and movement of soils should be considered.

IV. OPERATIONAL COST

(A) Electric power cost taking into account regional variations is an important consideration.

(B) Water cost taking into account regional variations should be considered.

(C) Existing and planned technological capabilities and facilities on the site area contribute to reducing operational costs. Include existing machine shops, electronic shops, maintenance and service shops, etc.

(D) Existing and planned technological capabilities and facilities in the vicinity of the site area contribute to reducing operational costs. Proximity to a commercial and industrial center with a well developed research and development base affects operational cost.

(E) Natural hazards affect operational costs. Include seismic disturbances, tornadoes and hurricanes as they affect operating costs.

(F) Climatic operational costs. Include heating, air-conditioning, water cooling, snow removal, etc., as they affect operational costs.

(G) Soil movement and load-bearing capacity relative to operational cost should be considered. Costs to realign experimental

facilities associated with preventative maintenance programs and emergencies, can be large.

(H) Regional wage variations and labor relations affect operational cost.

V. TRANSPORTATION

(A) Proximity to a major airport having or planning to have frequent service to major U.S. cities is desirable to provide easy access and minimum travel time for university users and other visiting research personnel.

(B) Availability of adequate surface transportation facilities for the movement of goods and transport of personnel should be considered.

VI. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(A) Proximity to colleges and universities should be considered.

(B) Strength of graduate and undergraduate programs in the physical sciences and the liberal arts available to the staff and their families is an important factor.

(C) Potential scientific and engineering interaction between the universities and the accelerator laboratory, and the relative merits of the impact of local university elementary particle physicists and engineers upon the work of the accelerator laboratory should be considered.

(D) Potential training of accelerator laboratory staff including availability of coursework and night classes for professional growth of the laboratory staff should be considered.

VII. COMMUNITIES

(A) Proximity of sizable communities within an hour's commuting time of the accelerator laboratory. A minimum population of 50,000 is required to assimilate the 2,000-staff member families and the transient staff.

(B) Availability of housing for the laboratory staff and laboratory visitors is important. The growth record of the community and its capability of adapting to change should be considered. Guest facilities in the communities should be available.

(C) The quality and adaptability of public school systems including the growth record and community interest in education are important.

(D) Availability of medical facilities. The adequacy, growth record, and community support of medical facilities are important.

(E) Churches, entertainment, recreational and other cultural facilities such as museums and libraries should be available.

VIII. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

(A) Consideration should be given to the special responsibility of the AEC for its own laboratories and the advantages of effective utilization of present AEC facilities.

(B) Consideration to the establishment of a new center of excellence. The impact of the accelerator laboratory on a local university makes possible the transition to a new level of performance. Desirability of broadening the educational base of the Nation should be considered.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I intend to comment on his remarks. If he wishes to stay, I would be happy to have him listen.

Mr. President, the 200- or 300-billion electron-volt proton smasher, which has been under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission for some time, may well be before Congress this year for financing, or it may be that a decision will not be made in time for financing this year.

I believe that the National Academy of Sciences and the Atomic Energy Com-

mission have considered and have had before them applications for some 185 locations in the United States for this particular project.

It is, of course, a desirable project from the standpoint of any State, and recently all but six sites were eliminated by the Atomic Energy Commission. Those six sites have been under visitation by members of the Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, by their staff of experts, and by others.

When I speak of this I believe I speak with some firsthand knowledge inasmuch as I was present at the visitation by the Atomic Energy Commission at the site close to Denver less than a month ago. So that when I speak of this, I speak of a matter with which I am familiar, and not of something I am conjuring out of the air.

First of all, I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that it may well be or could be—although I hope not—that Colorado would not be the final selection of the Atomic Energy Commission as to this site. It could just as well be that one of the five sites other than Colorado would not be the final selection of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Nevertheless, it would not occur to me to downgrade any of the sites included at the present time—Ann Arbor, Brookhaven, Chicago, Denver, Madison, Sacramento—or the people associated with them, nor any of the facilities offered by the sites, in the illusory concept that I would in any way be helping to locate the plant in the State of Colorado.

I want to comment on certain remarks that the Senator from Missouri has made, and I want to lay them out cold, because either he does not know what he is talking about, or he has never been to Colorado, or he has never bothered to do the necessary research. His must have been only very casual research, to have made his remarks so meaningless.

First of all, let us consider the power supply, which he says is "hopelessly inadequate" in Denver. I was present at the visitation of the Commission in Denver, and they asked many questions about the power supply. The graphs which were placed before the members of the Commission showed double lines of service, which are now almost complete, to the area under consideration. The members of the Commission seemed completely satisfied with this showing.

The criteria indicates that approximately 200 megawatts would be required. In this connection the Public Service Co. of Colorado has a large system of generating plants interconnected with high voltage transmission lines concentrating in the Boulder-Denver area, with a total at the present time of 1,000 megawatts. The total system capacity is in excess of 1,240 megawatts. A pump storage project now under construction will add 300 megawatts in 1966.

In addition, it is no secret that a large nuclear plant is planned for the area immediately north of Denver, which would greatly expand even this large amount of power.

As a matter of fact, there is not one iota of evidence here, or anywhere else,

to support the statement of the Senator from Missouri: "the Denver and Madison sites, both have a hopelessly inadequate power supply." I know nothing about Madison, and I would not do anything to downgrade our sister State of Wisconsin, even if I did.

The item alleged by the Senator from Missouri about power is completely out of the ball park. I think he completely misunderstands the facilities that are available. The Public Service Co. of Colorado is unmatched anywhere in the United States with respect to the forward looking technology it has applied to the electrical supply system for the service areas that it supplies.

Incidentally, this would not be the only plant, if it were built in Colorado, that the Public Service Co. would supply on a double line basis and some of these plants are critical to the welfare of the United States.

Originally there were eight criteria. However, our people used 10 even more critical criteria, which were not put together by the AEC or NAS. I shall discuss some of them, one by one.

One of the requisites in the original call of the AEC was proximity to a major airport. Mr. President, there is not a finer airport in the United States than the Denver Airport. One can alight from a plane in the Denver Airport, rent a car, and drive to this site within 30 minutes, without ever approaching the speed limit. How do I know this? Because we did it less than a month ago, in the company of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There is now available at the site one paved road. But if the site were selected, I think the more obvious solution would be to black top about 4 miles of road directly off the interstate highway, and it still would take less than 30 minutes for anyone arriving on a plane to reach the site.

It is true that this is not flat bottom land, but apparently the Atomic Energy Commission did not want flat bottom land on which to construct the bevatron. We discussed the details of the amounts of excavation that would be required for the construction of the bevatron and the kinds of materials that would have to be moved for its construction. The amounts of materials did not seem to be of particular concern to the commission at that time. It is a fact that a high-water table in interference with the activities of the bevatron never can be a problem at this site.

The Senator from Missouri says that there are 169 days a year in Colorado on which the temperature is below freezing. In his prepared text—or at least in the news release from his office—he said that Denver and Madison have 160 days of severe weather annually, which would cost the U.S. Government \$1 million per week. In his statement in the Senate, he said that Denver had 59 inches of snow, and that that "practically brings panic." Here, again, I say to the Senator that I do not know, speaking off the top of my head, what the actual snowfall in Denver is. It was only today that I learned that he was to make his speech. Whether it is 59 inches or any other

amount, I have lived in Colorado all my life, and I have never seen the time when snowfall caused panic anywhere in the State.

As a matter of fact, we have towns like Fraser and Aspen, places from 8,000 to 12,000 feet high in the mountains, in which we have the great and glorious ski country which the Senator seems to envy so much.

It is true that those parts of our State get cold. We not only get large amounts of snowfall, but we also pray for them in the wintertime because it means good skiing, a wonderful tourist season, and also the lifeblood of our State for our farmers in the summertime.

The implication of what the Senator says is that on 160 days out of the year the weather in Colorado is so severe that it would be impossible to operate.

Mr. President, I want to say a couple of things about the weather. I expect that I have flown between here and Colorado not less than 120 times—and perhaps 150 times—in the last 12 or 15 years. In all of those flights, I have been weathered out only one time.

If the weather were the kind that the Senator describes, certainly they would not put \$5, \$6, and \$7 million jets down on the airport in snow that is 3 or 4 feet deep. The circumstances themselves just do not justify the statement of the Senator. If the Senator had ever taken any trouble to investigate, he would know that they did not. If he had ever gone to Colorado in January and seen people working in their yards in their shirt sleeves, as I have on hundreds of occasions, he would know that while we often do have snow in the wintertime—and we never regret it at all—the snow is so dry there that often the snow simply sublimates into the air. We often have a 4- or 5-inch snowfall in the morning, but we have great difficulty in finding any of that snow in the evening except under a few bushes.

Mr. President, I want to add one thing with respect to transportation. One of the criteria put on this particular subject by the Atomic Energy Commission was that the operation be close to some large universities doing work in astrophysics.

I should like to say for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri that within 25 minutes by high-speed, four-lane, separated highways there is the University of Denver which has gained preeminence and outstanding recognition by NASA and many other institutions in the field of science. Within an hour, at the maximum, there is the University of Colorado which has great capability in nuclear physics and physics of every kind.

Immediately north, and still available by four-lane highway, is the great Colorado State University with a similar professional and scientific capability.

Mr. President, two of these institutions can be reached from this site without ever going through any kind of a traffic light. Of course, that situation is not true with respect to the university in downtown Denver.

In addition to that, we have our own great Colorado School of Mines, the only really true separate mining school in the

Nation today, one of the great schools of this country, with a great scientific capability in this area.

Our people were not just whistling in the dark when they put in an application and spent many hundreds of man-hours preparing the most detailed reports for the Atomic Energy Commission. However, when the flat statement is made here that we simply do not have the power supply and when the statement is made that we have 160 unfavorable days a year and 59 inches of snow which practically brings panic, my friend does a disservice to a sister State which I think does not do service to him. I do not know what particular place in his own State made application for this project, but whatever place it was, I am sure that it had good reason for making application and some reason for thinking that it could fulfill the criteria.

I want to say now, that I hope our chances of success do not rest upon the denigration and downgrading of another State in the Union. If these statements by the Senator from Missouri were based on actual facts, it would be an entirely different situation, but they are not based on facts. For that reason, I think the remarks of the Senator do a great disservice to him and to my State of Colorado.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have listened to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, with some concern.

I realize that in speaking on matters of this kind, after the development has been created, a Senator is always laying himself open to the statement that it is "sour grapes" because his State did not win.

I stated that Missouri was not selected. I have no intention at any time of downgrading Colorado or the State of any other Senator. But I am concerned about the entire program on a national basis.

As I pointed out in the earlier stages of my statement, certain criteria were set out that we were to follow and go by. These criteria were to serve as our guidelines. That is what not only Missouri but also many other States did. Then we woke up at the last moment and found that the guidelines were changed.

It raised a question in my mind, not that I have any thought that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, or other Senators from States in which sites were selected, would do the least thing wrong. They did present their best side and they are entitled to do that, and I would expect them to do it.

The Senator from Colorado always does that for his State, and he does a very able job of it. But when the Senator implies that we have not done any research on this and do not know what we are talking about, and when he bases his statement that this is entirely proper on the fact that it is done by the Atomic Energy Commission or the National Academy of Sciences, then I must say

that the Senator from Colorado himself has done no research.

Mr. ALLOTT. Can the Senator name a time or date when the snowfall in Denver practically brought panic?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes. It just so happens that the people doing the research on this are from Denver and from Colorado. Those are the words that were called to my attention not later than 5 minutes ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know who those people are. Can the Senator name them?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator takes great issue with the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission and other people with authority have done this. Let me read what they say. If the Senator wishes to call them liars, that is his privilege. I do not know them, but this is what the National Academy of Sciences report states:

The climate in Denver is characterized by a wide variation between day and night temperatures. The daily maximum temperatures, even in winter, tend to be above freezing, but temperatures drop sharply at night. Similarly, summer daylight temperatures are typically higher, the humidity is low, and nights are cold. Average daily maximums above 90 occur about 41 days each year.

I guess those are the days on which people are in their yards in their shirt-sleeves.

I continue to read:

Daily minimums on the average are below 32° on 161 days a year.

That is what the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences report states. I do not know them, but these are the people who are making the rules and that is what they say about the conditions which exist there.

I am not trying to downgrade the State of Colorado. I do not know on what basis they make their selection.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator yield while I read the official Weather Bureau temperatures for Denver?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. The daily maximum—and I am reading, starting in January. I shall read the maximum, the minimum, and the mean.

In January, it is 43.1, 16.8 and 30.

In February, 45.6, 19.3, and 32.5.

In March, 50.9, 24.8, and 37.9.

In April, 60.5, 34.3, and 47.4.

In May, 69.5, 43.8, and 56.7.

In June, 81, 53, and 67.

If the Senator wishes to say that the temperature varies between the day and the night, I would have to agree with him. Of course it does, because in the summer time we have temperatures over 90 degrees, and yet a blanket is commonly used at night for sleeping. That is why it makes such a delightful place, and why they like to live there.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator realizes, of course, that when the temperature drops below freezing, below 32 degrees Fahrenheit, this atom smasher cannot operate at capacity; and when it does not, that may cost us \$1 million more per week based on the \$60 million annual operating budget. The Senator

is not telling me that there are fewer than 160 days per year that the temperature drops below freezing?

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with the Senator. But I should like to ask the Senator if he knows that this atom smasher will be completely underground and thus, to a great extent, completely unaffected by temperatures.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I only know what the National Academy of Sciences, upon whose report the Senator bases his argument, says. They say it falls below 32 degrees 161 days of the year, and they say the average annual snowfall is 59 inches. That is what they say. I thought that would be from the horse's mouth, for me to go get their figures. They are the ones making the decision. I only wonder what they are basing that decision on.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not quarrel about the 59 inches of snowfall per year. We will take it and be happy to get it, every year in the century.

But I do wish to say I have never seen the time that the snowfall in Denver caused panic. As a matter of fact, we have in the State of Colorado at least a dozen mountain passes, all of which approach an altitude between 11,000 and 12,000 feet, and those passes are used constantly by people the year around, never being closed more than 3 or 4 hours, at the most, at any time; and many of the people do not even use snow tires.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator has a beautiful State and a great State. I am mighty proud that one of the mountains out there is named Long's Peak. I only wish I could say it had been named after me.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator had been there early enough, we might have done it.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. There is one other matter I should like to call to the Senator's attention. He mentioned power, that we had not done any research on that. Let me read once more what the National Academy of Sciences says about the power out there. I did not intend to go into all this detail about the Senator's State, but these are their words, what they say. After the Senator's statement about how much power they have, here is what the people making the decision say—and I want to know how they can make decisions on this basis:

A detailed study would be needed to determine whether the power transmission system which would supply the area will have sufficient capacity to insure acceptable voltage and frequency stability under all possible load conditions. The board of water commissioners has committed the city and county of Denver to supply the required amounts of water.

Denver is an attractive growing city with a population of more than half a million. The communities east of Denver in the direction of the site are good residential communities. The area offers adequate cultural opportunities. Schools are good. Recreational facilities are excellent. Industrial services in the Denver area are diversified enough to support the project.

Those last statements are in the Senator's favor; but they do say there is

some question about the power to be supplied there.

There is one other matter. The Senator is justly proud of his schools, as we are in Missouri, and as I am sure people are in every State. I am sure the State of Colorado has great schools.

But what did the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Academy of Sciences, who are deciding the matter, say about it? And I should like to know, after what they did say, how they could reach the decision they did.

They mentioned that the University of Denver is 20 miles from the site, the University of Colorado at Denver, 20 miles, and the University of Colorado at Boulder, 40 miles.

Then they add:

The sixth site, Denver, Colo., has neither the university strength nor the existing design group that is considered desirable.

I do not know those things. That is what I am reading from their report. And the more I read this report, about not only this but the other sites considered, the more I wonder upon what basis they could make such a determination.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator read correctly from the report of the Atomic Energy Commission. I think they are in error about that, and I should like to comment. Since the Senator has raised the problem of water, I do not think anybody in the world knows as much about their water supplies as some of our Western States. I do not mean just Colorado, I include all of our Western States, because we have to study and work on it, to take care of the problem.

The report says:

Domestic water will be required at an installation employing up to 2,000 people; and cooling water will be required for a synchrotron requiring approximately 200 megawatts of electrical capacity.

In this particular area, both the city of Aurora and the city of Denver have been able to guarantee, and we have developed, the water to fully supply everything that the proposed installation could possibly need.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I say to the Senator, I do not raise any questions about the water. We only raised the question about the power and about the schools after the Senator mentioned those matters, and about the temperature and the snow.

I do not wish to be critical of the Senator's State. I want to make that clear if I can. This is not an attempt to be critical of the site chosen, but it is an attempt to see the overall picture. The people have made these statements, but I cannot determine the basis upon which they made their selections. They have changed the rules on us, because those are the things the Atomic Energy Commission said were important, and that the decision had to be made on those bases.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us talk about power a moment. In addition to the things I have mentioned concerning the Public Service Co., the Bureau of Reclamation and the Public Service Co. of Colorado are now engaged in working out a joint plan for additional facilities; so as to

power, I do not think the Senator can justify his statement in any respect with respect to the power.

Then, as concerns the weather, I simply wish to say to the Senator that when he says the snowfall is 59 inches a year, and there are 160 days a year with below freezing weather, which practically brings panic, he is going clear outside the ball park.

PROGRESS IN THE SOLUTION OF THE POPULATION PROBLEM—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FAR-SIGHTED LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, where do we stand today in relation to the dissemination of birth control information upon request at home and overseas?

Today, I am pleased to report that we are moving slightly ahead to help bring our world population and our food supply into attunement.

This past week has been historic. Private citizens, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the House Committee on Agriculture here in Congress have taken steps aimed at helping solve the population explosion by means acceptable to individual belief.

On May 5 and 6 more than 1,000 participants from across the Nation, representing 65 national organizations, met in Washington, D.C., to attend the National Conference on Family Planning: Partners for Progress. The conference, sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, turned out to be a historic first conference on family planning. It was, I suggest, a good preliminary for a White House Conference on Population which should be preceded by well-planned State conferences.

I had the privilege of speaking before the men and women attending the conference, and I ask unanimous consent that the summary of recommendations forthcoming from the conference appear at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these recommendations touch on the pressing need to extend our domestic programs, our assistance to other nations, our research, our training and education, and on the general problem areas.

Said the recommendations in conclusion:

The clear message of this conference is that planning is an urgent issue in the United States and throughout the world, and that we have the knowledge and the resources to get the job done within the foreseeable future through a creative partnership of public and private institutions.

The national conference included panels on a variety of subjects of general interest. I ask unanimous consent that the program and panels and panel members appear as exhibit 2 at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the available list of participating organizations and the available names of the international sponsors council appear at the close of exhibit 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 2A.)

WISE AND FARSIGHTED LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the man who deserves the praise of mankind for his wise and farsighted leadership on the issue of population is President Lyndon B. Johnson. On 20 occasions he has spoken publicly on this urgent issue and his eloquent exhortations have concerned the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations, the need for our making bold and daring response to go to the root causes of misery and unrest, the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth, and he has thereby given positive mandates to the executive agencies for positive action. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his 20 public statements appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks as exhibit 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we see welcome indications that the executive departments are budging slightly from their previous inadequate approaches.

On Monday, April 11, 1966, the Department of State's Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, the Honorable Thomas Mann, when he testified before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures at the 27th public hearing on S. 1676, announced that he was naming a Special Assistant for Population Matters.

It is with deep regret that I learned this morning of the untimely death of Under Secretary Mann's special assistant for population matters, Mr. Robert W. Adams. He had started to take progressive and forward-looking action in this field and was in the process of cabling our embassies overseas to make certain they knew what our Government's policy was in regards to the dissemination of information concerning family planning. Further, Mr. Adams was requesting the embassies to let him know what the individual countries were doing in this area.

I hope the work he was initiating can be carried forth as he would have done.

On Thursday, May 5, 1966, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Under Secretary, the Honorable Wilbur Cohen, announced that Secretary John Gardner was naming a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Science and Population who would work directly under his Assistant Secretary for Science and Health, Dr. Phillip Lee. As I told those persons attending the national conference last week, I hope this budge is the beginning of a longer stride forward. It would appear this action comes as a result of further investigation into the problem by Secretary Gardner following his appearance before the subcommittee on April 7 when he did not think the

changes necessary. In any event, these are long-needed changes.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also announced that it was holding regional and State meetings on population and that it had appointed a task force to consider a national conference on population.

I do want to give assurance that the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures intends, while continuing its hearings on the population crisis, to watch closely the extent of change and meaningful activity in this area by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as other pertinent executive agencies. The subcommittee will look hopefully for signs of such increasing activity and will be more than happy to accord the Departments full credit when such signs become more visible and results tangible.

HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MOVES HISTORICALLY

We of the Congress can with pride applaud the action of our colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture who last week approved the world war on hunger by expanding broadly America's food-for-peace program and by encouraging other nations to become self-sufficient in food production.

The House Agriculture Committee recognized legislatively for the first time in the history of the Congress the world population explosion relationship to the world food crisis, by providing that the food-for-freedom program would encourage and assist those activities related to population growth which are undertaken by recipient nations.

A major provision of the bill which amends and extends Public Law 480 authorizes the use of foreign currencies for family planning if the recipient nation wishes.

This concept was proposed to the House committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOBB] who believed that making available soft currency funds generated by the sale of surplus American food abroad for programs of family planning, maternal and child health, and child nutrition is sensible and logical. And so it is.

When he introduced his amendments in March, Representative TOBB suggested that if the 89th Congress moved forward legislatively in the area of family planning it would be remembered far more in this context than in any other. He is correct, and I believe that Representative TOBB may properly be called a successful pioneer legislator in this field. Certainly the approval of this legislation will mean that the doors are open a little wider to help us solve the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations.

They will open wider still this Tuesday, May 10, 1966, when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] holds hearings on S. 2993, introduced by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] which proposes to provide long-overdue Federal funding for family planning clinics, private or public, in communities where they are desired.

Many books have been written about the population explosion. I hope that persons interested in the problem have

had the opportunity to read a book written by the ecologist Dr. William Vogt of New York City entitled "People! Challenge to Survival." It contains some grim reminders of what will happen to our beloved earth and to our quality of life if we do not take steps to bring people and resources into better alignment.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(Presented by George N. Lindsay, chairman, Planned Parenthood-World Population, at final plenary session, National Conference on Family Planning, May 6, 1966)

This has been a historic National Conference on Family Planning and an exciting one. On Wednesday, we saw the repeal of the Nation's last remaining restrictive law on birth control. Yesterday we heard of a major step forward in the policy of the Federal Government in the domestic field, and today, in the action on the House Agriculture Committee on the food-for-freedom bill, we have learned of a similarly promising breakthrough in our ability to help nations overseas. We can feel some satisfaction that these developments are not entirely unrelated to our conference.

All of us have worked hard for 2 days. We have had the privilege of hearing from some of the most knowledgeable physicians, scientists, health and welfare administrators, religious, business, and political leaders in the United States.

The highlight statistics themselves tell an impressive story: More than 1,000 participants, including representatives of 65 national organizations; 84 panelists; 8 major addresses. The groups participating in this conference comprise one of the most representative arrays of national organizations ever brought together under private auspices in this Capital. Surely this distinguished assemblage augurs wells for the great partnership of public and private effort which will be necessary to meet the world population crisis and U.S. family planning needs.

There have been no formal resolutions at the conference and not all participating organizations would necessarily be in agreement with all the recommendations for a positive forward program which have been made in the various panels and addresses. The significant contributions of organizational representatives to our deliberations, however, have made clear that Americans of diverse beliefs and viewpoints share a deep common concern over this issue. In this summary we have attempted to distill the sense of the discussions as a broad framework for continued creative collaboration.

Running through all of the panels and addresses has been the basic concept that the right to high-quality family planning services is a fundamental human right which enlarges the individual's opportunity freely to make basic, lifesaving choices. In the spirit of the movement for emancipation which Margaret Sanger launched a half century ago, this conference has been committed to two central propositions: First, that family planning is a personal and private matter which must remain entirely free of outside coercion. Second, that parents' voluntary decisions in this area can only be made when competent medical services are actively offered and made accessible to all with dignity and without discrimination. It is the task of our pluralistic service system, encompassing a variety of health, welfare, religious, and educational institutions in both private and public sectors, to work together to make these goals a reality without further delay.

There was overwhelming agreement on two major program emphases:

1. In the United States, we face a considerable backlog in the provision of family

planning services. This backlog is the result of long standing deficiencies in our medical care system and of widespread discrimination in the provision of health services to the poor. At the same time, the United States has the resources, capacity and obligation to face this backlog forthrightly and to provide, within the foreseeable future, competent family planning services to all families that need them and want them. The services should be offered with the aim of enhancing individual freedom of choice in regard to family size and child spacing. A variety of methods must be made available to guarantee that the family can choose a technique consistent with personal or religious beliefs.

2. In the United States, we presently have the resources, capacity and obligation also to provide far greater assistance—financial and technical—to nations overseas which require and request help in this field.

The extension of family planning was seen as decisive to the success of efforts to reduce poverty both at home and abroad. In addition to its intrinsic importance in helping poor couples and poor nations to help themselves, reports from many communities made clear that the initiation of family planning services can be instrumental in improving the general health services available to the poor and in opening up many new opportunities for employment of the poor in creative subprofessional jobs.

Although our existing knowledge and experience provide an adequate base for immediate and rapid expansion of programs at home and abroad, there is a continuing and pressing need for the extension of our fundamental knowledge in the area of fertility and infertility, and for further testing, experimentation and development of new medical techniques and improved methods of delivering this service.

At the same time, there is an immediate as well as a continuing need to train the physicians, scientists, nurses, social workers, administrators and subprofessional workers who will be required in these programs. Therefore, considerable expansion of educational and training efforts at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels will be required, as well as a wide variety of in-service training programs.

Perhaps one of the most extraordinary developments of this extraordinary conference was the clear and heartwarming demonstration that the dialogue between the major religious faiths has been transformed into a true working partnership for the enhancement of world and family health, welfare and freedom.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

In keeping within President Johnson's characterization of family planning as one of four critical domestic health problems demanding special attention, the panels yesterday and today attempted to define the scope of the need, assess the adequacy of current programs and project feasible means of meeting these needs. There remain substantial groups of Americans for whom family planning services are not currently available. The economically, culturally and geographically disadvantaged are deprived of adequate care in this field, as they are still deprived of other types of health care. It has been estimated that approximately 5 million fertile impoverished women are not pregnant or seeking a desired pregnancy at any given time, and that only one out of ten currently has access to competent family planning services. Low-income parents want as few children as higher-income parents—or even fewer—and respond in significant numbers when quality family planning services are made available with dignity and skill. To provide competent services to these families will require an estimated \$100 million annually. Legislation to earmark the

necessary Federal funds to augment local public and private funds for this program has been introduced by Senators TYDINGS, GRUENING, CLARK and others; but whether through new legislation or through the already existing administrative authority residing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the allocation of such funds, this relatively modest amount, in terms of our total national health budget, is needed for family planning services over the next 5 years. Federal and State funds should be made available on a matching basis specifically to make programs possible in local public and voluntary hospitals, health departments and suitable voluntary agencies.

Family planning must receive higher priority among the Nation's health services. The gap between the overwhelming professional consensus and existing programs must be closed without further delay so that family planning enters the mainstream of American medical practice. Federal, State and local governments must take leadership, in cooperation with private agencies, to establish and maintain an adequate network of family planning services.

Among the specific recommendations for domestic programs were the following:

1. Rapid establishment of comprehensive free or heavily subsidized post-partum family planning clinics in every public and voluntary hospital with an obstetric service, as the most efficient and economic base for an adequate network of services.

2. Massive expansion of family planning clinics operated by health departments, with special attention to the needs of rural areas.

3. The rapid implementation of the new forward-looking policies announced yesterday by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department must assign its best resources to this program and should call for the inclusion of voluntary family planning services in any comprehensive State health plan utilizing Federal matching funds.

4. Higher priority to family planning in the war against poverty: Encouragement of a family planning component in all community action programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide neighborhood-based services in the heart of poverty areas, and removal of arbitrary restrictions on eligibility for service, such as the limitation on use of OEO funds to purchase family planning supplies only for married women living with their husbands.

5. Sufficient trained staff and consultants in both HEW and OEO to provide on-the-spot technical assistance to local hospitals, health departments and community action programs in the organization and delivery of family planning services.

6. Planning at Federal, State, and community levels to coordinate public and private programs, guarantee comprehensive coverage and secure better deployment of manpower and improved use of facilities.

7. Special attention must be directed to social, health, and educational services that meet the needs of adolescents. Acceptable programs must be devised with proper safeguards, to assist our young people in reducing the incidence of out-of-wedlock births and early marriage necessitated by pregnancy.

ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS

The United States must provide substantially greater assistance to the developing nations to help them reduce their rates of population growth which threaten to nullify all efforts for economic and social development. Such assistance should be given at the request of the recipient nation and should be integrated into comprehensive aid for general economic and social development.

While there has been progress in U.S. aid in the population field during the last several years, much more can and must be done.

Among the recommendations were the following:

1. Larger expenditures for assistance on family planning programs, similar to the proposal of the White House Conference on International cooperation that the United States make available up to \$100 million annually over the next 3 years to help other countries implement these programs and strengthen national health and social services necessary for their support.

2. The United States should forthrightly make known to recipient countries that counterpart funds in sizable amounts can be utilized to help finance family planning programs in those countries, as authorized in the amended food-for-freedom bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee today.

3. The U.S. Government, in cooperation with the United Nations and other international organizations, private organizations and universities, should encourage the substantial expansion of facilities for education and training of U.S. and foreign personnel in all aspects of the population problem and the implementation of family planning programs.

RESEARCH

If the population problem is, as the President put it, second only to the search for lasting peace in its importance for the future of mankind, this priority remains to be reflected in the allocation of scientific resources in the United States. Almost every other field of scientific and medical interest—space, cancer, heart disease, blindness, mental health, and so on—commands a considerably larger share of Federal research funds than the \$2 million which Secretary Gardner stated will be spent this year for research directly related to the regulation of human fertility.

There was agreement that the time has indeed arrived to correct this situation. With our scientific capability and financial resources, it is indisputable that one of the most significant contributions we can make to the solution of the population problem throughout the world is through massive research to discover methods of fertility control suitable for use in different nations and cultures and acceptable to all faiths; to determine optimum patterns for implementation and administration of family planning services; to illuminate the factors which condition family size preferences; and to explain the relationship between population growth and economic development. It was suggested that the global population explosion is of such urgency as to require a crash program in which the great strides forward in biological knowledge are applied to this field.

1. An aggressive, large-scale program should be initiated by the Federal Government and private institutions to recruit scientific investigators to work in this field. Appropriate incentive programs, such as fellowships, professorships, and career development awards, should be established on a broad scale to insure that enough workers in the scientific disciplines involved are attracted to the field.

2. This year's appropriation for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development should be increased substantially to allocate a minimum of \$25 million, specifically and categorically, for research directly related to fertility control.

3. Federal funds and energetic leadership should be provided to establish an appropriate number of major institutes throughout the country within the next 5 years for the interdisciplinary study of human reproduction, fertility, and family planning.

4. Special emphasis should be placed on research to increase the acceptance and reliability of method, and to discover and make available other new techniques of fertility control.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

To carry out these programs will require thousands of trained workers—physicians, nurses, social workers, scientific investigators, administrators, planners, minister-counselors, clinic aids, community workers, and other subprofessional workers. In addition, the next generation must be given adequate opportunity to learn about population dynamics, human reproductive and fertility regulation. Such education should be made available to children at the earliest ages, consonant with their level of comprehension.

At the present time, education on family planning and population dynamics is inadequate in the Nation's professional schools and almost nonexistent in the Nation's colleges and high schools. Specific recommendations in this area include:

1. A coordinated program involving the major professional groupings—the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the religious groups—to insure the inclusion of comprehensive material on family planning and population dynamics in the curriculums of the relevant professional schools, and to develop intensive programs at the postgraduate level.

2. Regional training institutes for the diverse professional groupings, financed by the Federal agencies with responsibilities in this field (Public Health Service, Children's Bureau, Office of Economic Opportunity).

3. An extensive training program, conducted jointly by the operating agencies and appropriate educational institutions, to train persons for subprofessional jobs in family planning clinics and the community education program associated with them. It has been estimated that the equivalent of 55,000 full-time jobs would be created in domestic family planning services alone. Such a training program should receive high priority in the war against poverty.

4. A major effort, involving educational and professional organizations and private foundations, to integrate appropriate material on population dynamics, reproductive physiology, and fertility control in high school and college curriculums.

5. Development by the Public Health Service of mass educational materials on population dynamics and family planning for all Americans.

6. Special training for clergy and ministerial students to equip them to counsel parishioners in this field.

GENERAL

Additionally, there were several more general proposals. It was felt that the dialogue among the major religious groups which has developed in this field during the last several years demonstrated beyond doubt overwhelming agreement on the necessity for family planning, as long as personal beliefs are respected in these programs. It was evident that the dialogue will be intensified to deal with such questions as the moral issues associated with more widespread use of family planning and the need to involve all segments of the religious community in the social action and cooperation that will be necessary to provide family planning help to those most in need. Interfaith cooperation and mutual understanding in this field is not only desirable but has indeed become a moral imperative. The need for increased attention by the schools, the churches and other institutions to the total fabric of family life was also emphasized.

Similarly, the dialogue among business leaders and economists on the relationship between various rates of population growth and the future of the economy must be continued and broadened. Questions were raised as to the quality of life in an overcrowded

America if present growth rates continue. The first order of business was seen as the extension of competent family planning services to those Americans now deprived of them, but it was clear that a major educational effort must be initiated now to alert all Americans to the threat posed by rapid population growth. We need more systematic exploration of the diverse factors influencing the family size preferences of individual parents and the potential tension between these individual desires and overall social needs.

In sum, then, the clear message of this Conference is that family planning is an urgent issue in the United States and throughout the world, and that we have the knowledge and the resources to get the job done within the foreseeable future through a creative partnership of public and private institutions.

EXHIBIT 2

PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY PLANNING: PARTNERS FOR PROGRESS (Sponsored by Planned Parenthood-World Population and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, May 5-6, 1966, Shoreham Hotel)

Honorary sponsors council: Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, cochairmen; John Cowles, Sr., Lewis W. Douglas, Marriner S. Eccles, Milton S. Eisenhower, Arthur S. Flemming, Harry Emerson Fosdick, J. Kenneth Galbraith, Christian A. Herter, George F. Kennan, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Hermann J. Muller, Arthur W. Radford, John Rock, Elmo Roper, Whitney North Seymour, Lewis L. Strauss, Henry M. Wriston.

MAY 4

Advance registration, upper lobby, 5:30-8 p.m.

MAY 5

Registration in main lobby west, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Hospitality, lower lobby, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.
Film showings—Ambassador Room, 10 a.m. to 11 a.m.

Margaret Sanger "The Engagement Ring," the Planned Parenthood story.

Opening luncheon, Blue Room, noon

The Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presiding: Donald B. Straus, chairman, P.P.-W.P. executive committee.

Plenary session, Ambassador Room, 2 p.m.

Keynote address: The Honorable JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, U.S. Senate.

Chairman: George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.-W.P.

Concurrent panels, 3 to 5 p.m., research, Executive Room

Outstanding scientists will discuss the role of the Federal Government and the scientific establishment in enlarging research in the fields of reproductive physiology, fertility, contraceptive technology, family size motivation, and the social, economic, and cultural effect of population growth.

Franklin T. Brayer, M.D., director, Center for Population Research, Georgetown University.

Philip Corfman, M.D., program associate for population, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

E. James Lieberman, M.D., consultant, child psychology, National Institute of Mental Health.

Clement L. Markert, Department of Biology, Yale University.

John Rock, M.D., Rock Reproductive Study Center.

Sheldon J. Segal, director, Biomedical Division, Population Council.

Anna L. Southam, M.D., program specialist, reproductive biology, the Ford Foundation.

The Chairman: Richard L. Day, M.D., medical director, P.P.-W.P.

Foreign aid, Tudor Room

U.N., U.S. and foreign government leaders and demographers will discuss how we can better help other countries to help themselves meet the social and economic crises that are being brought about by the population explosion.

Robert W. Adams, special assistant to the Under Secretary for economic affairs, Department of State.

Edgar Berman, M.D., Chief Health Consultant for Latin America, Agency for International Development.

William V. D'Antonio, chairman, Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy.

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., chairman, Population Crisis Committee.

Stephen Enke, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense.

Frank W. Notestein, president, Population Council.

Robert S. Smith, Associate Assistant Administrator for program, Agency for International Development.

The Honorable PAUL H. TODD, JR., U.S. House of Representatives.

H. E. Radomiro Tomic, Ambassador of Chile.

H. E. Humberto Lopez Villamil, Ambassador of Honduras to the U.N.

Chairman: J. Mayone Styccos, director, international population program, Cornell University.

Domestic programs, Ambassador Room

The expanding role of Government in supporting birth control services through health departments, hospitals, the antipoverity program, etc., will be discussed by Federal authorities and health and welfare leaders.

Leslie Corsa, Jr., M.D., director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

Arthur J. Lesser, M.D., Deputy Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sar A. Levitan, the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.-W.P.

Mollie Orshansky, Division of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration.

Richard A. Prindle, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General of the United States.

Alvin L. Schorr, Deputy Chief, Research and Plans Division, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Chairman: Arnold Maremont, former chairman, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Reception, Ambassador Room, 6:45 p.m.

To honor the distinguished Members of the Congress, and the officials of the U.S. Government who have recognized the importance of responsible parenthood throughout the world.

Fiftieth anniversary banquet, Regency Ballroom, 7:30 p.m.

Address: The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senate.

Presentation of the Margaret Sanger Award in Human Rights to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., by Cass Canfield, chairman, governing body of International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Presiding: George N. Lindsay, chairman, P.P.-W.P.

MAY 6

Registration, main lobby west, 9 a.m.-5 p.m.
Hospitality, lower lobby, 10 a.m.-5 p.m.

Plenary session—Empire Room, 9 a.m.

Keynote address: "Public Policy at the Grassroots," Alonzo S. Yerby, M.D., commissioner of hospitals, New York City.

Chairman: Alan Guttmacher, M.D., president, P.P.-W.P.

*Concurrent panels, 10 a.m. to noon
Hospital services—Diplomat Room*

The directors of family planning services at leading public and voluntary hospitals, hospital administrators, and other professionals will discuss how hospital-based services can help meet the need for birth control in the United States.

David G. Anderson, M.D., University of Michigan Medical Center.

Gail V. Anderson, M.D., senior attending physician, Los Angeles County General Hospital.

Ernest Lowe, M.D., chief medical officer, Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, District of Columbia General Hospital.

Bernard J. Pisani, M.D., director obstetrics and gynecology, St. Vincent's Hospital, New York.

Nicholas H. Wright, M.D., U.S. Public Health Service officer, Emory University Medical School, Atlanta.

Chairman: Gordon W. Perkin, M.D., associate medical director, P.P.-W.P.

Public health programs, Forum Room

Public Health officials, professionals and educators will discuss the expanding role of public health departments in meeting communities' family planning needs.

Joseph D. Beasley, M.D., Material and Child Health Section, Tulane University School of Medicine.

William Cassel, M.D., chief of maternal and perinatal health, California State Department of Health.

Elizabeth C. Corkey, M.D., assistant health director, Mecklenburg County N.C.

Murray Grant, M.D., director of Public Health, District of Columbia.

David M. Heer, assistant professor biostatistics and demography, School of Public Health, Harvard University.

Mrs. Anne G. Huppman, executive director, Planned Parenthood Association of Baltimore.

Robert Stepto, M.D., Chicago Board of Health.

Chairman: Johan W. Eliot, M.D., assistant professor population planning, University of Michigan School of Public Health.

Poverty programs, Empire Room

Some 18 antipoverty programs throughout the United States now include birth control. Representatives from some of these programs, economists, and social welfare leaders will discuss the effectiveness of family planning in the War on Poverty.

Lisbeth Bamberger, acting chief, Health Division, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity.

James G. Banks, executive director, United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable JOHN CONYERS, JR., U.S. House of Representatives.

Evelyn Hartman, M.D., director, Maternal and Child Health, Minneapolis Health Department.

Frederick S. Jaffe, vice president, P.P.-W.P.

Lawrence Maze, M.D., director, Family Planning Program, Homer Phillips Hospital, St. Louis.

Mrs. J. R. Modrall, board member, Office of Economic Opportunity, Albuquerque.

Ray Tardy, Sheldon Complex Community Action Program, Grand Rapids.

Chairman: Rev. Eugene Callender, chairman of the board, Haryou-Act, Inc., New York City.

The religious consensus, Tudor Room

Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen, theologians, and philosophers will discuss the moral implications of expanded birth control programs; and the growing involvement of the religious community in social action necessary to provide family planning help to those most in need.

Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., professor of law, Georgetown University, and director,

Institute of Law, Human Rights and Social Values.

Louis Dupré, associate professor of philosophy, Georgetown University.

Rev. William H. Genné, director, Commission on Marriage and Family, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president American Jewish Congress.

Dr. Carl F. Reus, director of research and social action, the American Lutheran Church.

Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, director, Interreligious Affairs, American Jewish Committee.

Chairman: Rev. Richard M. Fagley, Executive Secretary, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

Luncheon, Palladian Room, noon

The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Presiding: Charles Horskie, Advisor (to the President) for National Capital Affairs.

CONCURRENT PANELS, 2 TO 4 P.M.

The business consensus—Tudor Room

Businessmen and economists will discuss growing corporate concern about the population problem here and abroad; social and economic consequences of unchecked population growth, and the relationship between the denial of family planning services to the poor, and the growth of the economic dependency.

Richard L. Breault, associate director research, Task Force Economic Growth and Opportunity, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Richard C. Cornuelle, executive vice president, National Association of Manufacturers.

William V. D'Antonio, chairman, Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy.

Martin R. Gainsburgh, vice president and chief economist, National Industrial Conference Board.

Harvey C. Russell, vice president, Pepsi-Cola Co.

(Other panel members to be announced.)

Chairman: Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., commerce and industry chairman, P.P.-W.P.

Americans' tomorrow—Diplomat Room

The rapid growth of U.S. population with its attendant problems of urban sprawl, water and air pollution, overcrowded schools, traffic jams, etc., is the result of "planned" three and four-child families by the middle-class and well-to-do. Leading authorities will discuss what can be or should be done to help couples recognize the possible consequences of even moderate-sized families to the "quality of life" for tomorrow's Americans.

Robert C. Cook, president, Population Reference Bureau.

Louis Dupré, associate professor of philosophy, Georgetown University.

Ray Lamontagne, associate, John D. Rockefeller, 3d.

Leonard Lesser, general counsel, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO.

William T. Liu, associate professor, sociology; and director, Institute for Study of Population and Social Change at Notre Dame.

The Honorable William H. Robinson, program consultant, Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

Paul Lester Wiener, professor of urban planning, Columbia University.

Chairman: Donald B. Straus, president, American Arbitration Association; chairman, Executive Committee, P.P.-N.P.

The professional consensus, Empire Room

Representatives of leading medical, social welfare, family planning, public health, and nursing organizations will discuss the vital stake of the professions in expanding knowl-

edge, training and action about population, and family planning in their ranks.

Leslie Corsa, Jr., M.D., chairman, Program Area Committee on Population and Public Health, American Public Health Association.

M. Edward Davis, M.D., president, American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians.

James R. Dumpson, first vice president, American Public Welfare Association; associate dean, School of Social Work, Hunter College.

Elizabeth Edmands, R.N., assistant professor, population and family health, the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

Jesse W. Johnson, assistant director, Health and Welfare, National Urban League. Alan I. Levenson, M.D., staff psychiatrist, National Institute of Mental Health.

Joseph P. Martin, M.D., board chairman, Bell Center Birth Control Clinic, Cleveland.

Jules Pagano, Director, Adult Education, Office of Health Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Chairman: Mary S. Calderone, M.D., executive director, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States; former medical director, P.P.-W.P.

The response of the public, Forum Room

Nine out of ten of the Nation's poor families who need birth control are, in effect, denied it. Panelists will discuss the birth control attitudes and practices of those now without birth control help.

Do they want it? Will they use it? What kinds of services are needed?

Donald J. Bogue, director of the Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago.

Mrs. Marjorie Schumacher, executive director, Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington.

Christopher Tietze, M.D., director of research, National Committee on Maternal Health.

Charles F. Westoff, Office of Population Research, Princeton University.

Mrs. Charles F. Whitten, Michigan Welfare Board.

Chairman: Mrs. Naomi T. Gray, field director, P.P.-W.P.

Plenary session, Empire Room, 4 to 5 p.m.

Summary of panel recommendations:

George N. Lindsay, chairman of Planned Parenthood-World Population.

Closing remarks by Alan F. Guttmacher, M.D., president of Planned Parenthood-World Population.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

(Partial list)

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

The American Assembly.

The American Association of University Women.

American Association on Mental Deficiency.

American Bar Association.

American Civil Liberties Union.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Americans for Democratic Action.

American Ethical Union.

American Friends Service Committee.

American Jewish Committee.

American Jewish Congress.

The American Lutheran Church.

American Medical Association.

American Nurses' Association.

American Public Health Association.

American Public Welfare Association.

Arrow, Inc.

Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church.

Catholic Council on Civil Liberties.

Central Conference of American Rabbis.

The Child Welfare League of America.

The Choats Foundation.

Community Service Society.

Congress of Racial Equality.

The Cooperative League of the U.S.A.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Family Service Association of America.
Haryou-ACT, Inc.
Institute for Study of Population and Social Change at Notre Dame.
International Convention of Christian Churches.
Lutheran Church in America.
Margaret Sanger Research Bureau.
Medical Committee for Human Rights.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Education Association.
National Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds.
National League for Nursing.
National Medical Association.
National Social Welfare Assembly.
National Urban League.
Population Crisis Committee.
Presbyterian Interracial Council.
Protestant Episcopal Church.
Resources for the Future, Inc.
Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.
Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
State Charities Aid Association.
Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.
The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Young Women's Christian Association.

**INTERNATIONAL SPONSORS COUNCIL
(Partial list)**

Representative BROCK ADAMS; Chief S. O. Adebayo, Ambassador Nigeria to U.N.; Conrad Alken; Mohsin Alaini, Ambassador Yemen Arab Republic to U.N.
George V. Allen, president, Tobacco Institute; D. W. Ambridge, board chairman, Abitibi Power & Paper Co.; J. Amonzegar, Minister of Health, Iran.
Dillon Anderson; Robert O. Anderson, chairman, Atlantic Refining Co.; Stratis G. Andreadis, chairman, Commercial Bank of Greece.
F. S. Arkhurst, Ambassador of Ghana to the U.N.; Sverker C. Astrom, Ambassador of Sweden to the U.N.; John Bardeen; Jacques Barzun.
Fernando Belaunde Terry, President of Peru; Thomas Hart Benton; L. V. Berkner, director, Southwest Center for Advanced Studies; Sarah Gibson Blanding.
Konrad E. Bloch; Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Corp.; Edward E. Booher, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co.; Lord J. Boyd-Orr; Lord Russell Brain.
Walter H. Brattain; Benjamin Britten; Pearl S. Buck; Ralph J. Bunche; Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States.
Sir F. MacFarlane Burnett; Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, Partner, Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Chester Carlson; Senator FRANK CARLSON; Sir James Chadwick.
Ilka Chase; Stuart Chase, Carlos Chavez; Lieou Chieh, Ambassador of China to the U.N.; Brock Chisholm, Former Director-General, WHO.
Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK; Kenneth B. Clark; Sir John Cockcroft; Lord George James Cole, chairman, Unilever.
Gershon B. O. Collier, Ambassador Sierra Leone to U.N.; James Conant; Aaron Copland; Thomas Corbishley, S.J.
Carl F. Cori; F. H. Corner, Ambassador New Zealand to the U.N.; Norman Cousins; Gardner Cowles; Dana S. Creel.

* Nobel Laureates.

Frederick J. Crosson, Director of General Program, Notre Dame; Sir Henry Hallet Dale; Henrik C. P. Dam.*

William V. D'Antonio, Notre Dame; Ossie Davis; John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College; Edwin Dickinson; Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.

Senator PETER DOMINICK; Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN; John Dos Passos; James R. Dumpson; Louis Dupré, Georgetown University.

Mohamed Awad El-Kony, Ambassador United Arab Republic to U.N.; Byron K. Elliott, Chairman, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH.

John F. Enders; Orhan Eralp, Ambassador Turkey to U.N.; Morris L. Ernst; Senator PAUL FANNIN; James Finn, editor, Worldview; John Fischer.

Representative O. CLARK FISHER; R. G. Follis, chairman, Standard Oil Co. of California; Emerson Foote; William Friday, president, University of North Carolina.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT; Radomir Gerić, Assistant Secretary for Health, Yugoslavia; William F. Glauque.*

Weldon B. Gibson, executive vice president, Stanford Research Institute; Donald A. Glaser; Representative EDITH GREEN; Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

Representative HARLAN HAGEN; Otto Hahn; Oscar Handlin; Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania; Michael Harrington.

Harlan H. Hatcher, president, University of Michigan; Werner Heisenberg; Katharine Hepburn; Ben M. Herbster, president; United Church of Christ.

Christian A. Herter, Jr.; Walter R. Hess; Jaroslav Heyrovsky; Hudson Hoagland, William Ernest Hocking; Paul G. Hoffman.

Jerome Holland, president, Hampton Institute; Sidney Hook; H. Mansfield Horner, chairman, United Aircraft Corp.; J. K. Horton, president, Southern Cal. Edison Co.

H. Stuart Hughes; Langston Hughes; Robert M. Hutchins; Andrew Huxley; Sir Julian Huxley; Robert S. Ingersoll, chairman, Borg Warner Corp.

Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS; J. Hans D. Jensen; John H. Johnson, publisher, Ebony; Shidzue Kato, Senator, Japan.

Jefferson W. Keener, president, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Urho Kekkonen, President of Finland; Edward C. Kendall; John Cowdery Kendrew.*

James R. Killian, chairman, M.I.T.; Martin Luther King; George B. Kistiakowsky; Hannes Kjartansson, Ambassador Iceland to the U.N.; Otto Klineberg.

Douglas M. Knight, president, Duke University; Arthur Kornberg; Sir Hans A. Krebs; Leon Kroll; Joseph Wood Krutch; Polykarp Kusch.*

Willis E. Lamb, Jr.; Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores; Robert Lazarus, chairman, F. & R. Lazarus & Co.

Roger Lewis, chairman, General Dynamics Corp.; Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador Greece to U.N.; Ulla Lindström, Minister of Technical Assistance, Sweden.

M. Albert Linton; Fritz Lipmann; Walter Lippman; Alberto Lleras Camargo; Sir Ben Lockspeiser; John L. Loeb; Louis E. Lomax.

Bishop John Wesley Lord; Archibald MacLeish; Neil H. McElroy, board chairman, Procter & Gamble Co.; Senator GALE W. MCGEE.

Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, William L. McKnight, board chairman, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; Edwin M. McMillan; Marya Mannes.

Giacomo Manzù, Archer J. P. Martin; Peter Brian Medawar; Gulsepe Medici, Karl D. Menninger, Gian Carlo Menotti, Robert K. Merton.

Senator LEE METCALF, Darius Milhaud, Representative CHESTER L. MIZE, Waldemar Mo-

linski, College for the Study of Catholic Theology, Berlin.

Theodore Monod, Institute of France; Ashley Montagu, Douglas Moore, Edward P. Morgan, Representative THOMAS G. MORRIS, Senator FRANK E. MOSS.

Reuben H. Mueller, president, National Council of Churches; Hermant J. Muller*, Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Lewis Mumford, William P. Murphy*.

Gunnar K. Myrdal, Burudi Nabwera, Ambassador of the Republic of Kenya; Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Allan Nevins, Phillip John Noel-Baker*.

John H. Northrop*, Frank Notestein, Michael Novak, James F. Oates, Jr., board chairman, Equitable Life Assurance Society.

Sir Duncan Oppenheim, chairman, British American Tobacco Co.; J. Robert Oppenheimer, Fairfield Osborn, Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER.

Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, Iran; H. Bruce Palmer, president, National Industrial Conference Board; Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Member of Parliament, India.

Rosemary Park, president, Barnard College; C. Jay Parkinson, president, the Anaconda Co.; Hugh B. Patterson, Jr., publisher, Little Rock Gazette; Linus C. Pauling*.

Sir Denning Pearson, chief executive, Rolls-Royce Limited; James A. Perkins, president, Cornell University; Max Ferdinand Perutz*, Bishop James A. Pike.

Gregory Pincus, Walter Piston, Kenneth S. Pitzer, president, Rice University; Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

C. B. Powell, publisher, the Amsterdam News; Donald C. Power, chairman, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.; Rabbi Joachim Prinz.

Harold Quinton, chairman, Southern California Edison Co.; Sir Chandrasekhara V. Raman*; J. Saunders Redding, Tadeus Reichstein*, Walter Reuther.

Dickinson W. Richards*, David Riesman, Frederick C. Robbins*, David Rockefeller, Representative James Roosevelt, Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

Lessing J. Rosenwald, Zenon Rossides, Ambassador of Cyprus to U.N.; Richard H. Rovere, Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, Bayard Rustin, Jonas E. Salk.

Irving Salomon, board chairman, Royal Metal Manufacturing Co.; Carl Sandburg, Frederick Sanger*.

Henry B. Sargent, president, American & Foreign Power Co.; Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Mark Schorer, Emilio Segrè*.

Frederick Setz, president, National Academy of Sciences; Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Ambassador of Nicaragua to U.N.; Harlow Shapley.

Roger L. Shin, dean of instruction, Union Theological Seminary; William Shockley*, Alan Simpson, president, Vassar College; Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON.

Gerald A. Sivage, president, Marshall Field & Co.; C. R. Smith, board chairman, American Airlines; Sir C. P. Snow, Wendell M. Stanley*.

Ernest Lyman Stebbins, dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, the Johns Hopkins University; Julius Stratton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Jack I. Straus, chairman, R. H. Macy & Co.; Anna Lord Strauss, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Hays Sulzberger.

Albert Szent-Györgyi*, Shigeki Tashiro, board chairman, Toyo Rayon Co.; Edward L. Tatum*, Deems Taylor, Harold Taylor.

Prince A. Taylor Jr., president, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church; A. Hugo Theorell*, Norman Thomas, Virgil Thomson.

Lord Alexander Todd*, George J. Tomer, Ambassador, Syrian Arab Republic to U.N.; Charles H. Townes*, Arnold J. Toynbee, Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS.

Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Harold C. Urey*, Mehdi Vakil, Ambassador, Iran to U.N.; Mark Van Doren.

Bruno Visentini, chairman, Ing. C. Olivetti; Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt Wallace, James D. Watson*, Lagroua Weill-Hallé, Paul Weiss, Thomas H. Weller*.

Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., chairman, Pitney-Bowes; Fred L. Whipple, director, Smithsonian Astrophysics Observatory; George H. Whipple*.

John F. White, president, National Educational Television; Paul Dudley White, Jerome B. Wiesner.

Francis O. Wilcox, dean, School of Advanced International Studies, the Johns Hopkins University; Maurice H. F. Wilkins*, Roy Wilkins.

Erwin H. Will, board chairman, Virginia Electric & Power Co.; C. Vann Woodward, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Alonzo S. Yerby, Whitney M. Young, Jr.

Representative ARTHUR J. YOUNGER, Karl Ziegler*, Sir Solly Zuckerman.

EXHIBIT 3

STATEMENTS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON CONCERNING POPULATION

1. State of the Union address before Congress, January 4, 1965: "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

2. The 20th anniversary of the United Nations at San Francisco, June 25, 1965: "Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth."

3. Swearing-in ceremony of John W. Gardner as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in Rose Garden, the White House, August 18, 1965: "This administration is seeking new ideas and it is certainly not going to discourage any new solutions to the problems of population growth and distribution."

4. Text of letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant at Second United Nations World Population Conference opening in Belgrade, August 30, 1965:

"MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The U.S. Government recognizes the singular importance of the meeting of the Second United Nations World Population Conference and pledges its full support to your great undertaking.

"As I said to the United Nations in San Francisco, we must now begin to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying population. Our Government assures your conference of our wholehearted support to the United Nations and its agencies in their efforts to achieve a better world through bringing into balance the world's resources and the world's population.

"In extending my best wishes for the success of your conference, it is my fervent hope that your great assemblage of population experts will contribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem. Second only to the search for peace, it is humanity's greatest challenge. This week, the meeting in Belgrade carries with it the hopes of mankind."

5. State of the Union address before Congress, January 12, 1966:

"That is what I have come to ask of you.

3. "To give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program, designed to make a maximum attack on hunger, disease, and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves, and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth.

6. "I will also propose the International Health Act of 1966—

"To strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared-for suffering of the world—and by wiping out smallpox, malaria, and controlling yellow fever over most of the world in this decade;

"To help countries trying to control population growth, by increasing our research—and by earmarking funds to help their efforts."

7. Ceremony held at the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, January 20, 1966, Independence, Mo.:

"We will increase our efforts in the great field of human population. The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance. Each man and woman—and each nation—must make decisions of conscience and policy in the face of this great problem. But the position of the United States of America is clear. We will give our help and our support to nations which make their own decision to insure an effective balance between the numbers of their people and the food they have to eat. And we will push forward the frontiers of research in this important field."

8. Foreign aid program message to the Congress, February 1, 1966:

"Yet today the citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of misery—

"Half the adults have never been to school; "Over half the people are hungry or malnourished;

"Food production per person is falling; "At present rates of growth, population will double before the year 2000.

"These are the dominant facts of our age. "They challenge our own security.

"They threaten the future of the world. "Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace."

9. "Only these people and their leaders can—

"Invest every possible resource in improved farming techniques, in school and hospital construction, and in critical industry;

"Make the land reforms, tax changes, and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies;

"Face the population problem squarely and realistically;

"Create the climate which will attract foreign investment, and keep local money at home."

10. "In many other countries food output is also falling behind population growth. We cannot meet the world food needs of the future, however willing we are to share our abundance. Nor would it serve the common interest if we could."

11. "We stand ready to help developing countries deal with the population problem.

"The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this problem. It is first a matter of individual and national conscience, in which we will not interfere.

"But population growth now consumes about two-thirds of economic growth in the less-developed world. As death rates are steadily driven down, the individual miracle of birth becomes a collective tragedy of want.

"In all cases, our help will be given only upon request, and only to finance advisers, training, transportation, educational equipment, and local currency needs.

"Population policy remains a question for each family and each nation to decide. But we must be prepared to help when decisions are made."

12. "Technical cooperation: This request—\$231 million—will finance American advisors and teachers who are the crucial forces in the attack on hunger, ignorance, disease, and

the population problem. The dollar total is relatively small. But no appropriation is more critical. No purpose is more central."

International Education and Health Acts message, February 2, 1966:

13. "We have committed ourselves for many years to relieving human suffering. Today our efforts must keep pace with a growing world and with growing problems."

14. "Therefore, I propose a program to— "Create an international career service in health;

"Help meet health manpower needs in developing nations;

"Combat malnutrition;

"Control and eradicate disease;

"Cooperate in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems."

15. "Food production has not kept pace with the increasing demands of expanding population."

16. In part 5, the President carefully spells out his proposal "to cooperate in worldwide efforts to deal with population problems:

"By 1970, there will be 300 million more people on this earth. A reliable estimate shows that at present rates of growth the world population could double by the end of the century. The growing gap—between food to eat and mouths to feed—poses one of mankind's greatest challenges. It threatens the dignity of the individual and the sanctity of the family.

"We must meet these problems in ways that will strengthen free societies—and protect the individual right to freedom of choice.

"To mobilize our resources more effectively, I propose programs to—

"1. Expand research in human reproduction and population dynamics. We are supporting research efforts through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, AID, and the World Health Organization. I am requesting funds to increase the pace and scope of this effort. The effort, to be successful, will require a full response by our scientific community.

"2. Enlarge the training of American and foreign specialists in the population field: We are supporting training programs and the development of training programs through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and AID. We will expand these programs at home and abroad.

"3. Assist family planning programs in nations which request such help: Here at home, we are gaining valuable experience through new programs of maternal and infant care as well as expansion of private and public medical care programs. Early last year we made clear our readiness to share our knowledge, skill, and financial resources with the developing nations requesting assistance. We will expand this effort in response to the increasing number of requests from other countries."

War against hunger message, February 10, 1966:

17. "Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in death rate."

18. "A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem."

19. Domestic health and education message, March 1, 1966:

"FAMILY PLANNING

"We have a growing concern to foster the integrity of the family, and the opportunity for each child. It is essential that all families have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience.

"In the fiscal 1967 budget, I have requested a sizable increase in funds available

for research, training and services in this field. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will expand its own research and its grant program to study human reproduction. The Children's Bureau and the Office of Economic Opportunity will support family planning to the maternal and infant care programs in local communities when requested. State agencies will be aided by Federal welfare funds to provide family planning services to mothers."

20. Economic aid to India message, April 1, 1966: "The Indian Government believes that there can be no effective solution of the Indian food problem that does not include population control. The choice is now between a comprehensive and humane program for limiting births and the brutal curb that is imposed by famine. As Mrs. Gandhi told me, the Indian Government is making vigorous efforts on this front."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by Senate May 9, 1966:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Donald Opie McBride, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Ten-

nessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1975.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, FR1519 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Robert M. Lee, FR590 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Jacob E. Smart, FR592 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. William S. Stone, FR1039 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, FR1530 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. David A. Burchinal, FR1936 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

The following named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of im-

portance and responsibility designated by the President, under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, U.S. Army.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

May 5, 1966

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, effective from the date of his retirement.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning W. Michael Blumenthal, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending James A. Smith, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 29, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Seaborn P. Foster, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending Murray David Zinoman, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 25, 1966.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Phillip N. Austen, to be colonel, and ending Thomas Zalewski, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 19, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Norbert H. Adams, to be second lieutenant, and ending Donald L. Zumwalt, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 25, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Entrance Fee Policy Needs Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation recently passed by Congress was the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The law marked a great stride forward in a comprehensive program for developing recreational areas in the United States. I supported this bill which received almost unanimous endorsement from the Congress.

There are, however, several points that need to be ironed out in connection with the language of the bill. Particularly in light of the recent announcement by the Corps of Engineers to charge entrance fees at recreational areas at Federal reservoirs, does it become imperative that Congress take a second look at the fee policy which is one of the key features of the land and water fund.

On four Federal reservoirs in my State of South Dakota the fees will be initiated on May 30. There is, however, before Congress, in particular before the Public Works Committee, a bill which would exempt those Federal reservoirs which are not deriving more than half of the benefits in the form of recreation. Since all Corps of Engineers projects are designed primarily for conservation and flood control purposes, it would mean no fees could be charged at recreation areas on corps reservoirs. The bill H.R. 13313 must be passed before the May 30 deadline at which time fees will be collected.

These fees would tend to discourage the second largest industry in South Dakota, tourism, because most of the adequate sites for launching boats and for just viewing the reservoirs will be under the "chargeable" category of the present law. Where there are facilities such as hydraulic boat launches and showers or other developed facilities, it is only fair that some type of user fee be charged. But an admission fee does not seem equitable with the purposes of the current law.

Hopefully, Congress will act soon on H.R. 13313, which clarifies the current

law, clears up an important omission of the original law, and yet does not disrupt the intent and purpose of the Land and Water Conservation Act in any way.

The Artificial Water Recharge System of Minot, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1966

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, thanks to some ingenuity in planning, and the scientific and technical skills displayed by representatives of the U.S. Geological Survey, the North Dakota Water Commission and the city of Minot, N. Dak., that city today appears to have temporarily solved a serious water supply deficiency problem.

In 1963-64, the water level in aquifers—subsurface, water-bearing rocks—in the Minot area, which provides the